

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

Public Participation at Local Government Level in South Africa: A Critical
Analysis of Integrated Development Planning and Ward Committees

Nonkosi Mngxali

Student Number: mngnon008

A minor dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
award of the degree of Master of Social Science in Public Affairs and
Administration

Faculty of the Humanities

University of Cape Town

2008

COMPULSORY DECLARATION

This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree. It is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this dissertation from the work, or works, of other people has been attributed, and has been cited and referenced.

Signature

Signed by candidate

Date:

05/09/2008

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	i
Executive Summary.....	iii
Abbreviations.....	iv
 CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Objectives.....	2
1.3 Methodology.....	3
1.4 Public Participation in Developmental Local Government.....	3
1.5 Developmental Local Government.....	4
1.5.1 Integrated Development Planning.....	5
1.5.2 Ward Committees.....	6
1.6 Chapter Outline.....	6
1.7 Limitations.....	7
 CHAPTER 2: CONCEPTUALISING PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	
2.1 Introduction.....	8
2.2. Defining Public Participation.....	8
2.3 Positive Accounts.....	9
2.4 Negative Accounts.....	11
 NOTIONS OF A COMMUNITY.....	16
2.5 Definition of ‘community’.....	17
2.6 Conflicting Interests/ Self-interestedness.....	19
2.7 Social Capital.....	20
2.7.1 Social Capital and Disgruntled Citizens.....	22
 POWER RELATIONS	
2.8 Power Relations.....	23
2.8.1 Differences within Communities.....	23
2.8.2 Models of Power and Participation.....	24
2.8.3 Chamber’s Paradigm Shift & Power Relations.....	25
2.8.4 Community Participation and the State.....	26
2.8.5 Gender Relations.....	28
2.9 Conclusion.....	29
 CHAPTER 3: DEVELOPMENT OF DEMOCRATIC SOUTH AFRICAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT	
3.1 Introduction.....	30
3.2 History of South African Local Government.....	30
3.3 Local Government Transformation.....	33
3.4 Municipalities, Demarcation & Re-demarcation.....	34
3.4.1 Challenges of Amalgamation.....	35
3.5 Developmental Local Government.....	36
3.5.1 The Legislative Framework for Developmental Local Government.....	37
3.5.2 The Constitution.....	37

3.5.3 The White Paper on Reconstruction and Development.....	38
3.5.4 The White Paper on Local Government.....	39
3.5.5 Participatory Planning.....	39
3.6 Integrated Development Planning.....	40
3.7 Ward Committees.....	41

CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH FINDINGS ON PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT LEVEL

4.1 Introduction	44
4.2 Effectiveness of Citizens Engagement in SA Local Government.....	44
4.3 Integrated Development Planning and Ward Committees in Practice.....	47
4.3.1 Political Challenges.....	48
4.3.2 Administrative/ Capacity Challenges.....	53
4.3.3 Sociological Challenges.....	59
4.4 Findings.....	63
4.5 Conclusion.....	65

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION.....66

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....70

Executive Summary

The introduction of a democratic dispensation in South Africa in April 1994, drew the idea of public participation in public affairs into the spotlight. Section 152 (1) of the Constitution (Act 108 of 1996) provides for public involvement in the sphere of local government, by compelling it to “provide democratic and accountable government for local communities; and encourage the involvement of communities and community organisations in the matters of local government.” The intention behind the decentralisation reforms was to transform local councils into organs with significant responsibility for the socio-economic well-being of all communities. Municipalities are mandated to promote developmental local government which focuses on development in an integrated and sustainable manner, and address socio-economic inequalities.

The objective of this thesis is to establish whether structures at local government level, which are set up to enhance public participation in local decision-making, are effective and whether participation is meaningful. Particular attention will be given to prominent platforms for public participation at local government level, namely: *Integrated Development Planning* and *Ward Committees* in the period post-2000 to date. Subjecting such approaches to rigorous critical analysis is as important as constantly asserting their benefits. For the purposes of this dissertation secondary sources will be used; looking at books, briefing and conference papers, academic debates and literature and past studies done on IDPs and ward committees in practice in different areas in South Africa. Literature assessing the current state of public participation in local government will be articulated and analysed. The challenges identified are grouped into three broad themes, namely, political, administrative/capacity, and sociological.

It is evident from the findings that there has been some public participation taking place at the local government level it is however limited. When it does take place it is not always effective and citizen’s concerns do not reach the municipal and/or integrated plan agenda. Communities remain highly fragmented, party political influence plays a significant role, and the culture of public participation in local government structures remains limited. Municipalities remain with inadequate capacity to deliver on their mandates, especially in the former black areas and townships.

Abbreviations

ANC	African National Congress
BLA	Black Local Authority
DA	Democratic Alliance
DFA	Development Facilitation Act
DLG	Developmental Local Government
DMA	District Management Areas
DPLG	Department of Provincial and Local Government
GNU	Government of National Unity
IDP	Integrated Development Planning/ Plans
IFP	Inkatha Freedom Party
LED	Local Economic Development
LGNF	Local Government Negotiation Forum
LGTA	Local Government Transition Act
MDB	Municipal Demarcation Board
NP	National Party
PPP	Public Private Partnerships
RDP	Reconstruction and Development Programme
SANCO	South African National Civic Organisation
TLC	Transitional Local Councils
USN	Urban Sector Network
WLA	White Local Authority

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

The introduction of a democratic dispensation in South Africa in April 1994, drew the idea of public participation in public affairs into the spotlight. Section 152 (1) of the Constitution (Act 108 of 1996) provides for public involvement in the sphere of local government, by compelling it to “provide democratic and accountable government for local communities; and encourage the involvement of communities and community organisations in the matters of local government.” The intention behind the decentralisation reforms as stated in the *Local Government White Paper* (RSA, 1998: 17) was to transform local councils into organs with significant responsibility for the socio-economic well-being of all communities. Municipalities were thus mandated to promote developmental local governance, in other words, focus on poverty alleviation, economic growth, the management of development in an integrated and sustainable manner, and to address socio-economic inequalities (Davids, 2005: 11). Legislation requires that development planning be participatory, that is, a process that incorporates the voices of the communities affected by the planning. This paper attempts to explore the challenges to meaningful public participation, both conceptual and practical, in *Integrated Development Planning* (IDP) and *Ward Committees* in South African local government.

Integrated development plans and ward committees are the main arenas in the new Developmental Local Government in South Africa within which development planning is to take place, with the result being an integrated plan. According to Davids et al., (2005: 111) ‘participation’, a new buzzword, got its popularity from a growing recognition of the need to involve stakeholders in development interventions. The international rationale for the promotion of public participation and partnerships (i.e. Integrated Development Planning -IDP), public private partnerships (PPPs), and local economic development (LED), rests on the belief that if the public participate in development programmes, then these programmes will lead to upliftment of local people and local decision-making will be seen as legitimate (Theron, 2005: 111).

One could also argue that although some of the enthusiasm for people-centred development has abated since the years of the release of the RDP, the idea of popular participation continues to exercise a significant influence over development thought in South Africa. Emmett (2000: 502) states that conceptions of civil engagement such as community-based or people-centred development, and citizen participation can be found in many, if not most, of the policy documents of the post apartheid state. Notwithstanding the broad support and frequent calls for more community participation, the concept itself is said to be fraught with practical and conceptual difficulties.

1.2 Objectives

The focus of this thesis is on analysing the public participation process in local government in South Africa. The objective is to establish whether structures at local government level, which are set up to enhance public participation in local decision-making, are effective and whether participation is meaningful. Particular attention will be given to prominent platforms for public participation at local government level, namely: *Integrated Development Planning* and *Ward Committees* in the period post-2000 to date. Subjecting such approaches to rigorous critical analysis is as important as constantly asserting their benefits. It is also essential to establish whether public participation fulfills its intended roles, some of which are: allowing beneficiaries to influence the direction of development planning and output, obtaining information on local needs, and giving a voice to often marginalised groups such as women and children. However, as stated in Cleaver (2001: 54), a detailed collection of empirical evidence of the effectiveness of participation, which, despite over a decade of implementation of participatory approaches, is surprisingly limited.

“Despite such significant claims, there is little evidence of the long-term effectiveness of participation in materially improving the conditions of the most vulnerable people...and is reliant on assertions of the rightness of the approach and process rather than convincing evidence of [its] outcomes” (Cleaver, 2001: 36).

1.3 Methodology

For the purposes of this dissertation secondary sources will be used: looking at books, briefing and conference papers, academic debates and literature and past studies done on IDPs¹ and ward committees in practice in different areas in South Africa. Literature assessing the current state of public participation in local government will be articulated and analysed. More importantly, I am trying to establish what challenges the public participation process faces in practice in South Africa. Are there in fact conceptual and practical difficulties of its application in South African local government, as many authors are arguing? What are the obstacles to meaningful public participation, and are they applicable exclusively to the South African case?

Participatory development literature maintains too oversimplified ideas about the beneficial nature of participation, and tends to overlook the links between inclusion and possible subordination. While there is strong emphasis on the opportunities of participation of individuals, there should also be an assessment of the constraints experienced by potential participants. There needs to be a re-analysis of 'participatory approaches', particularly in relation to the tensions between empowerment of people, the efficiency of projects, the problematic notions of a 'community' and, the power relations on the ground that tend to affect participation. The notions of community, citizen and public participation are used interchangeably in this thesis.

1.4 Public Participation in Developmental Local Government

De Visser (2006: 36) argues that the breakdown of the relationship between state and society is one of the most critical factors impeding on development in Africa. The author goes on to argue that "the revitalisation of the relationship between the governors and the governed should form the backbone of Africa's development efforts" (De Visser, 2006: 36). There is an element of choice that is associated with the definition of development which entails the opportunity for people to make choices in the institutions of local government. It is suggested that this choice can be exercised through ideas that encompass local democracy, namely democratic elections and citizen participation (De

¹ The acronym IDP signifies either "integrated development planning" or "integrated development plan", as appropriate.

Visser, 2006: 36). The spin-offs of citizen participation are said to include improved decision-making. It is said to enhance and strengthen the relations between citizens and government and serves as a check on administrative authority (De Visser, 2006: 38).

With citizen participation there is often the threat of corruption through local elites who may hi-jack the process. Meaningful participation may be undermined when participation becomes the mere sanctioning of plans and policies put forward by the municipality. It is assumed that citizen participation entails input by those with local 'expertise' or 'knowledge'. Marginalised sectors of society do not always feature in this input, which is often dominated by business interests or other organisations with considerable resources (De Visser, 2006: 38). Role confusion may also result where citizen participation is viewed as a process whereby every decision and action of the local administration needs to be sanctioned and approved by the community. It is argued that citizen participation should be "an ongoing process of debate, dialogue and communication between local government authority and the community" (De Visser, 2006: 39). Participatory governance is said to be an essential component of local government if municipalities are to live up to developmental aspirations.

1.5 Developmental local government

Developmental local government is defined in the White Paper on Local Government (1998: 17) as "local government committed to working with citizens and groups within the community to find sustainable ways to meet their social, economic, and material needs and to improve the quality of their lives." Four interrelated characteristics of 'developmental local government' are identified in the above White Paper, namely:

- maximising social development and economic growth;
- integrating and co-ordinating the development activities of a variety of agents;
- democratising development by empowering communities to participate meaningfully in development; and
- providing leadership, promoting the building of 'social capital', and creating opportunities for learning and information-sharing.

In order to translate the above ideas to practice national legislation on municipalities has created innovations such as ward committees, a code of conduct for councillors, integrated development planning, performance management and alternative service delivery mechanisms etc. (Atkinson, 2003: 2). It is clear that the idea of 'popular participation' exercises a significant influence on development thought. Ordinary citizens are encouraged, through these structures, to participate in the decision-making processes of their local municipalities and to make their voices heard.

1.5.1 Integrated development planning

The integrated development planning process for local government was introduced as an approach and method to achieve co-ordination and integration between a variety of actors and interests to set strategic priorities and specify how to deliver on them (Ambert and Feldman, 2002: 4). According to Cameron (2004: 28), IDPs are the flagship development tool of municipalities, and should reflect a council's vision for the long term development and the municipality's internal transformation needs. Building on the Local Government Transition Act (No. 109 of 1993), the Municipal Systems Act (No. 32 of 2000) constructed a new planning framework for developmental local government, namely the IDP. The Municipal Systems Act is an elaborate statute setting standards for citizen participation in local government, local public administration, service delivery, municipal tariffs etc. (De Visser, 2006: 85).

It is generally argued that to mandate grassroots development and public participation, integrated development planning (IDP) should be used as a vehicle (Rauch, 2003: 1). The municipality must have a document that sets out how it intends to go about drafting, adopting and reviewing the IDP, which is usually termed the 'process plan'. The 'process plan' must allow for the local community to participate in the drafting of the IDP in order to establish community needs and priorities (De Visser, 2006: 104). The issues raised by the community can range from maintenance backlogs, the existence of poorly serviced areas, problems experienced with service delivery, and local economic development etc. Further details on the operation of IDPs will be discussed in chapters three and four.

1.5.2 Ward committees

Ward Committees became an option for municipalities with the local government elections of December 2000. According to the Urban Sector network (2003: 9), although ward committees are not the only vehicle for community participation in local government, they exist currently as the most broadly applied and accepted model. Ward committees exist to ensure participation in local government and are seen as a key mechanism for communication with the public. Chapter 6 of the South African Constitution (Act 108 of 1996) denotes that Ward Committees and their members can participate in local government in the following way:

- assessing and approving the budget
- planning and developing the Integrated Development Plans – Ward Committees should work closely with councillors and other community organisations to identify priority needs and make sure these needs are included.

Section 152 (1) of the South African Constitution requires of a local authority to encourage the involvement of communities and community organisations in matters of local government (RSA, 1996). Ward committees are chaired by the Ward councilor and composed of community members and act as an advisory body to the municipal council. Members are elected by communities residing in the ward area and should represent a diversity of interests in the ward. The Council, however, makes the rules for electing Ward Committee members. Further discussion on the workings on ward committees will be discussed in chapters three and four.

1.6 Chapter Outline

Chapter two provides the foundation of this study by reviewing both international and local literature on the positive and negative accounts of public participation. The conceptual analysis of these accounts forms the basis of the empirical research which is explored in the last chapter of this thesis. Chapter three will be analysing apartheid urban policy which had a number of characteristic features which define the scope of the problem that any future urban policy must address. These features of the policy included: “control of urbanisation; refusal to acknowledge increases in the urban population; racial segregation of settlements; racially divided local authorities; and gross racial disparities

in access to services and housing” (Planact, 1992: 1). Chapter four then explores public participation in practice (through the IDPs and ward committee structures) in local government in South Africa. This chapter explores the challenges faced by municipalities by breaking them down to three broad themes, namely: political, administrative/capacity and sociological challenges. The last and concluding chapter, chapter five, provides a brief summary of all major discussions and findings in the paper.

1.7 Limitations

While there is a great need for a detailed collection of empirical evidence of the challenges to effective public participation in all South African municipalities, this data is limited. The case studies and research reports reviewed in chapter four of this paper highlight only a few municipalities and it is not the intention of this paper to argue that all municipalities in South Africa fall under the same umbrella of challenges. The research studies that are referenced are not representative of the country as a whole but provide a broad picture of some of the challenges faced. It is beyond the scope of this paper to analyse each and every municipality in South Africa. I have relied on secondary sources; including books, briefing and conference papers, academic articles, debates and literature on public participation in theory and practice.

CHAPTER 2

CONCEPTUALISING PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

2.1 Introduction

There has been a lot written on what public participation is and what it should be. Given the increasing influence of participatory approaches, it is unsurprising that they have attracted an increasing amount of attention from commentators as they have critics. The following chapter will look at both the positive and negative accounts of participation. More specifically it looks at the assumptions of the value of participation as well as the problematic nature of participation.

2.2 Defining Public Participation

A variety of definitions of participation have been offered by different authors. Public participation is often defined as “an ongoing process of debate, dialogue and communication between the local government authority and the community” (De Visser, 2005: 39). Participation is considered a voluntary contribution by citizens in decision-making processes with a view that development will be enhanced if people are actively involved in the projects that affect them (Parfitt, 2004: 538). Jennings (2000: 1) sees participation as “the involvement by a local population and, at times, additional stakeholders in the creation, content and conduct of a programme or policy designed to change their lives... using local decision making and capacities to steer and define the nature of an intervention.” Sisk et al. (2001: 147) argue that participation is intrinsic to the core meaning of democracy.

Parfitt (2004: 538), argues that community participation is an active process by which beneficiary or client groups influence the direction and execution of a development project with a view to enhancing their well-being in terms of income, personal growth, self-reliance or other values they cherish. From the above statements it is assumed that project participants will have a say in the design, management and evaluation of the projects, which as will be discussed later, is not always the case.

Masango (2002: 52), argues that in democratising the governing process, public participation conveys information about public needs and demands from the public to policy-makers and implementers, and vice versa. Reddy (1996: 4) supports the above view by arguing that in order to ensure that the needs and aspirations of the people are taken into consideration in the policy-making process, there should be constant interaction between the governors and the governed. It is argued that it is also important to encourage popular support for democracy and the institutions that give expression to it, and that this should not be limited to voting in elections but also in the regular interaction between the public and such institutions. It is assumed that because policy-makers are meant to make policies on behalf of society, that they will take into account the needs of communities during the policy-making process.

2.3. Positive Accounts

Clapper (1996: 75), argues that citizen participation can serve as a means of converting dependency into independence –that is, converting the poor from passive consumers of the services of others into producers of those services. This is seen as a vast source of manpower, information and expertise for the attainment of national and local goals, as well as an opportunity for the citizens to grow. Going back to an earlier statement of citizen participation being the Achilles heel of planning in local government, Brynard (1996: 134) lists a few arguments as to the importance of participation in planning:

- Participation is a means of obtaining information about local conditions, needs, desires and attitudes. This information may be important to achieve informed and implementable decisions in the planning process.
- Participation is a way of involving and educating the public. The benefit of involvement being that people are more likely to be committed to a project of programme if they are involved in the planning and preparation.
- Participation is a means of balancing the demands for central control against the demands for the unique requirements of local government and administration. The more distant any form of government is from public accessibility, the more likely the planning of unpopular projects or programmes.

Participation in planning as advocated by the above arguments, allows for openness, and therefore the reduction of corruption, and the maintenance of high standards. The

participation of citizens in the planning process is seen as having the ability to empower citizens vice versa public officials, which in turn may help overcome possible bureaucratic dysfunctions. One can see from the above arguments for participation in planning that, for various reasons, planning cannot be left totally to the officials and authorities. There are practical and moral reasons put forward for the participation of citizens in planning. The above arguments do not however address the issues of whether people want to participate in the planning process, and if so, whether they are able to. There is evidence that suggests that on many occasions people do not participate actively in local planning, even when given the opportunity to do so (Brynard, 1996: 135).

Liebenberg and Stewart (1997: 125), define popular participation as an active process in which the participant takes initiative and takes action that is stimulated by their own thinking and deliberation and over which they can exert effective control. Again, one can see how popular participation is viewed as a means of empowering people, and as a way of enabling people to make their own decisions in terms of their development needs and priorities. We shall in the later section on the negative accounts of public participation, show how this view of public participation is not often realised. Migdley (1986: 8), an often quoted author also saw participation as not only humanising the bureaucracy, but also as strengthening the capacities of individuals and communities to mobilise and help themselves. It is assumed in the above statements that dependence on the state is minimised and that ordinary people rediscover their potential for co-operation and mutual endeavour. This is a dangerous assumption to make as one cannot accept that all people get to participate in the affairs of the community, without also taking into consideration the adequacy of the participatory systems in place.

Davids et al. (2005: 113), explain that the meaning of public participation differs depending on the context in which it applies. This, it is argued is what adds to the confusion in which the public participation debate is steeped, in South Africa and anywhere else. This is what led to authors like Davids et al (2005: 113) to argue that defining public participation should relate to the experience and exposure of that part of the process or intervention. Yet again the problematic understandings of the definition of public participation are put forward by the above authors: that it is an exercise of people's

power in thinking, acting and controlling their action in a collective framework. Gran (1983: 2) argues that public participation can give women, the youth and other groups of people who are often marginalised the opportunity to influence the outputs of local governance and development processes (Davids, 2005: 27). Davids (2005: 27) argues that the potential benefits of participation, such as the one above, do not suggest that it is a panacea for the complex challenges that confront local government and developing countries. He added that in South Africa, after a decade of formal participation practices, we have yet to see some of the potential benefits of public participation materialise.

2.4 Negative Accounts

Golooba-Mutebi (2004: 290) articulated the argument made by many sceptics that enthusiasm for participation disregards the unrealistic demands it makes on people, with more pressing demands on their times and in their lives. There are many issues highlighted by different authors for the problematic nature of participation. Golooba-Mutebi (2004: 290) argues that enthusiasts for participation fail to realise that while individuals have preferences and are aware of the need for collective action to defend them, they also have a restricted capacity to explore their interest situation and that there is a strong temptation to free-ride on the actions of others. These authors see participation that requires ordinary people to give up their time and limited resources as problematic, and hard to sustain. Some of these negative accounts of public participation will be addressed in more detail in the sections that will follow.

Hickey and Mohan (2004: 11) highlight that the key arguments against the participatory approach include an obsession with the 'local' as opposed to wider structures of injustice and oppression. Other authors such as Mosse (1994), Kothari (2001) and Cleaver (1999), argue that there is an insufficient understanding of how power is instituted and how empowerment might occur. Current approaches are seen as emphasising participation, but with a very broad definition of what participation actually means in practice.

Cleaver (2001: 36) highlights how authors such as (Oakley et al. 1991), and (Nelson and Wright, 1995) saw the theorising of participatory approaches as often being dichotomised into means/ends classifications. This brings us to the efficiency and empowerment

arguments, which see participation as a tool for achieving better project outcomes, and as a process that enhances the capacity of individuals to improve or change their own lives, respectively. The scope of and limitations to the empowering effects of any project are said to be little explored, and a number of problems are said to arise in analysing empowerment projects. It is often unclear who is to be empowered –the individual, the ‘community’, or categories of people such as ‘women’, ‘the poor’ or the ‘socially excluded’ (Cleaver, 2001: 38).

Parfitt (2004: 541), argues that participation has been criticised at two levels, that of its theoretical coherence and that of its practice. He adds that many of the theoretical critiques of participation are addressed to the issue of inadequate analysis of power and community. Parfitt (2004) in his article: “*The ambiguity of participation: a qualified defence of participatory development*”, argues that most critiques of participatory practice are directed to Chambers’ work, and its inadequate conceptualisation of power. Parfitt notes that there is a tendency in Chambers’ work to romanticise and essentialise the poor and the social systems by which they operate, which conceals the important differences, within the marginalised, along lines of class, gender, and ethnicity. Chambers is accused of a reductionist account of power relations that leads to an under-analysis of the community.

Kothari (2001: 140) points to Chambers’ tendency to present social relations as binary relation between ‘uppers’ who possess power, and ‘lowers’ who are without power. This is where the notion that participation must be about reversing this situation so that ‘lowers’ are empowered and ‘uppers’ disempowered, arises. Kothari (2001: 140) argues that the exclusive focus on the micro-level, and on people who are considered powerless and marginal, has reproduced the simplistic notion that the sites of social power and control are to be found solely at the macro- and central levels. Kothari (2001: 140) goes on to state that these dichotomies further strengthen the assumption that people who wield power are located at institutional centres, while those who are subjugated and subjected to power are to be found at the local or regional level –hence the valorisation of ‘local knowledge’ and the continued belief in the empowerment of ‘local’ people through

participation. As will be highlighted in Chapter Four, it is evident that power struggles do in fact take place within the local level.

Kapoor (2002), provides a somewhat different critique of Chambers' account of power. He [Kapoor] notes that Chambers equivocates between two positions, one being the binary division of society between uppers and lowers that Kothari focused on, the other being the more complex approach to analysis of local communities (Parfitt, 2004: 543). Parfitt (2004) and Kapoor (2002), share the view that the two positions held by Chambers both envisage power as a negative influence, a force that those who are advantaged use to repress those who are disadvantaged. Kapoor's commentary is seen by Parfitt (2004: 543), as starting from the basis that Chambers presents an undertheorised account of power that leaves out account of the insight that power is inevitably embroiled with the formation of knowledge. In this sense what these two authors are saying is that power cannot be eliminated from the developmental field since it is unavoidably involved in the formation of development knowledge. Parfitt (2004: 543) further argues that the danger in proposing that power can and should be eliminated from participatory initiatives, lies in the certainty that less obvious forms of power will certainly persist and there is the likelihood that some of them will be repressive, perhaps just as repressive as the more overtly top-down power relations that they purportedly perform.

Cooke (2001) brings to bear the critical insights from a social-psychological perspective. Cooke (2001: 102), highlights that social analyses of what happens when people work together in groups suggest that the very processes of participation can restrict the ability of participatory development to deliver what is claimed for it. Cooke (2001: 102) argues that unless well-documented limitations of participation are acknowledged, it will continue to contain within it the seeds of destruction, and worse, harm those it claims to help. Group interactions are seen as manifesting themselves in different ways that can be problematic for the proponents of participatory development. The four analyses identified by Cooke: risky shift, the Abilene paradox, groupthink and coercive persuasion, suggest that there are social psychological limits to what can be achieved through participatory development.

The phenomenon of *risky shift*; found that group discussion leads group members to take risky decisions than they would have taken as individuals, suggesting that the organisation of people into participatory groups may make them more prone to that risk. Among the explanations for risky shift the following three recur:

- Risk-taking is a cultural value, the argument being that in US society risk is valued, and that in the group situation most individuals want to appear willing to take greater risks than the average person in order to enhance their status in the group.
- The risky individual is the most influential. It is suggested that high risk takers have the opportunity to use more colourful, and thus more persuasive, rhetoric than that open to the risk averse, which is inherently conservative.
- Diffusion of responsibility. The actual sharing of responsibility means that individual accountability for a given decision is blurred. (Cooke, 2001: 107).

Parfitt (2004: 546) however argues that it is notable that the contention that groups will take more risks than individuals is premised on their living in cultures that values risk taking – for example, the United States of America (USA). He goes even further by suggesting that it is questionable how far this would apply to poor people in the South, who are usually identified as being conservative in their attitudes towards risk in view of their understanding of the dire consequences if such risk fails to pay off for them (Parfitt, 2004: 546). It is not clear, when speaking about the South, whether the author is referring to the American South or that of third world countries. One therefore cannot unquestionably apply his views on a broad level.

The *Abilene paradox* suggests that group actions often contradict what the group members really want to do, thus defeat the purposes they are trying to achieve. Parfitt (2004: 546) recognises that the central factor in bringing about this outcome is a propensity for members of a group not to communicate and to make ill-founded assumptions about what others want, leading to decisions that run counter to what the group members actually wanted. It should however be acknowledged that participatory methodology does not necessarily have to fall into this trap. The phenomenon of *groupthink* indicates that groups can reach a false consensus when they reach a form of

spirit de corps that displays certain characteristics. These include over-confidence about the power and capabilities of the group; a proclivity to rationalise away discouraged feedback; an unquestionable acceptance of the morality of the group; negative stereotyping of out groups; self-censorship of any pressure against anybody who does express doubt; the tendency of some members to adopt the role of the foregoing, and a sense of false unanimity (Cooke: 2001: 113).

The final type of group dysfunction that Cooke refers to is *coercive persuasion*, which can be summarised as brainwashing. Cooke (2001: 117), suggests that coercive persuasion in the participatory context consists of a three-phase process: the first stage consists of destabilising a subject's socio-ideological orientation through techniques based on disconfirmation of that person's world view. The second stage is that of 'changing' the orientation of the subject to the viewpoint preferred by the conscientiser by getting him or her to identify with the role model provided by the conscientiser. The final stage is that of 'refreezing' the new orientation through positive techniques of confirmation.

Butterfield (2005: 12), argues that participation is a mantra, and that with all mantras certain questions are begged. In this case, he mentions that two significant questions regarding participation are raised repeatedly: the first concerns who participates, and the second revolves around the issue of the character and quality of that participation. Butterfield (2005: 15), argues that both the intent of the South African legal framework and the logic of effective participation for development require that participation be inclusive. In the case of traditional societies two overlapping groups are said to often be excluded from decision-making arenas: women and the poor. Women are said to be often excluded because of patriarchal social structures that place a high value on male leadership and decision-making to the exclusion of women. The poor (including women) are often be excluded in favour of not only the wealthy and the relatively well off (i.e. those who have sufficient assets to enable them to take advantage of opportunities more effectively than those without assets) (Butterfield, 2005: 13). Therefore if development projects are to benefit the most vulnerable, it is vital that these groups be given a voice.

The second question raised by Butterfield (2005: 16) regarding participation, concerns the quality or character of participation. It is argued that participation should not be measured by how many wards and development forums have been created, in the case of South African local government, but should be measured by how meaningful the participation is. Davids (2005) suggests that there is an important distinction to be made between consultation and participation, with consultation seen as a limited form of participation. The above authors argue that participation implies a partial transfer of power to the public –the power to help set agendas, determine priorities and flesh out planning.

To move from rhetoric to reality, observers of the public participation process warn that three obstacles to public participation need careful attention, namely: structural, administrative and social obstacles (Theron, 2005: 123). Centralised, top-down and prescriptive obstacles are said to be part of the political system and are at variance with grassroots, bottom-up participation. Administrative structures are often control-oriented and follow rigid, blueprint-style guidelines (Theron, 2005: 123). This becomes problematic because such structures do not allow room for public input or control over the process. Kumar (2002: 29), suggests that social obstacles like hopelessness, the culture of dependency, marginalisation, poverty, dominance and gender inequality militate against public participation (Theron, 2005: 123). The above authors, along with others such as White (1999), and Cooke and Kothari (2001), note that there exists a gulf between public participation theory and practice.

NOTION OF A 'COMMUNITY'

There are a number of conceptual problems associated with the assumption that there is 'a community' which is able to participate in the development project or programme. Some authors are said to resort to the geographical definition of community where there are clearly various alternative definitions and conceptions of community. With regards to public participation it is important to understand the conceptualisation of 'community' in order to fully appreciate the challenges faced in the participatory process. The

constitution of communities and municipalities, as will be discussed later in this paper, will have an influence on participation in local participatory structures.

2.5 Definition of ‘community’

Emmett (2000: 503) demonstrates how in South Africa the notion of community has become associated with a variety of other referents such as class, race, the people etc. A related problem is said to be the fact that communities are seldom, if ever, homogenous and unified. Crankshaw’s (1996) analysis of conflicting interests of different categories of residents in Bekkersdal was a good example of how the diversity of interests in communities can impact on development. In the above mentioned community the different categories consisted of council tenants, home owners, backyard shack tenants, informal settlements and hostel residents.

Cleaver (2001:44) also notes that there is a strong assumption in development that there is one identifiable community in any location and that there is coterminosity between natural (resource), social and administrative boundaries. The author goes on to highlight that the assumed self-evidence of ‘community’ persists in participatory approaches despite considerable evidence of the overlapping, shifting and subjective nature of ‘communities’ and the permeability of boundaries (Cleaver, 2001: 44). Participatory approaches are said to stress solidarity within communities, whereas: processes of conflict and negotiation, inclusion and exclusion are occasionally acknowledged (Cleaver: 2001: 45). Development practitioners are said to excel in perpetuating the myth that communities are capable of anything, that all that is required is sufficient mobilisation (through organisations) and the latent capacities of the community will be unleashed in the interests of development. It has already been stated elsewhere in this paper that there is little evidence to support such claims, and even where a community appears well motivated, dynamic and well organised, severe limitations are presented by an inadequacy of material resources, and by the very real structural constraints that impede the functioning of community-based institutions (Cleaver: 2001: 46).

Nelson and Wright (1995: 15) observe that “community participation is a concept often used by the state and other organisations, rather than the people themselves, and it carries

connotations of consensus and 'needs' determined within parameters set by outsiders." This yet again can be seen as the concealment of powerful interests at the intra-community level (Mohan, 2001: 160). The danger in accepting these actions based on 'consensus' may in fact empower the powerful vested interest that manipulated the participatory process. Ideas about local institutions are said to be based on the problematic notions of community. Cleaver (2001: 44), argues that the 'community' in participatory approaches to development is often seen as a 'natural' social entity characterised by solidaristic relations. There is an assumption in participatory discourse that these solidaristic relations can be represented and channelled in simple organisational forms. These assumptions are unsatisfactory for a number of reasons, which authors such as Cooke have articulated.

Midgley (1986: 25), notes that although definitions of community may vary, most authors do relate the concept of community participation to notions of deprivation and disadvantage. "Deprived rural communities and urban squatter settlements are comprised of the poor, the very poor and the not so poor who have differential access to resources" (Midgley, 1986: 25). It is argued that even deprived communities are differentiated in terms of status, income and power. Because of the uncritical attitude to communities, some proponents of community participation have failed to adequately deal with the problems of interpersonal relationships that arise in all communities. Midgley (1999: 35), argues that a clearer understanding of these problems would allow a more realistic assessment of possibilities and challenges that will be faced by participatory initiatives.

White (1999: 29) suggests that it be kept in mind that the concept of community is not necessarily commonly understood, or interpreted. The author goes on to argue that the over-arching idea for thinking about community in a way that is meaningful to a development context, is that a community is a collection of people linked together by communication within a physical environment that can be altered by their collective action. While one can see that this author is moving towards the geographic-centred definition of a community, denounced by other authors, she suggests that it is communication that creates community. It is argued that the kind of communication that creates community must be that of active interpersonal communication, leading to

common sense of purpose and solidarity (White, 1999: 29). Effective communication linkages are seen as enabling people to define their own problems, set their own goals, come up with their own solutions, and optimise individual and group abilities to learn, resolve their differences, and to act on their differences, and to act on their behalf (White, 1999: 30).

2.6 Conflicting Interests (self-interestedness)

The remedy which is usually put forward to deal with the diversity of interests in communities is to expand the representativeness and inclusivity of participation by the community. But, argues Parfitt (2000: 503), this strategy assumes that the interests and differences in the community are reconcilable, and that it is possible to obtain consensus. He goes on to suggest that what is often overlooked is that a certain degree of trust is necessary in order for divergent interests to reach consensus or compromise. It is said to be rational that people expect some kind of return on the time and energy they invest in a community. Emmett (2000: 504), suggests that the arguments that the whole community will benefit from the project does not hold water because in reality it is inevitable that some members of the community will be required to invest more of their time in the project than others. This may be a major reason why community members are prepared to become involved in development projects, rather than the common assumption that their involvement is motivated by a desire to benefit the community as a whole (Emmett: 2000: 505).

There are various responses from community members that one should expect if community members are seen as motivated by self-interest to participate in development projects and find that the projects do not meet their expectations:

- Enthusiasm for the project might wane and active community members might gradually withdraw from the project
- Active community members might bend the rules of the project in order to benefit themselves and those close to them.
- Pressure might be brought to bear on the development agents to provide direct or indirect compensation.

- Conflicts might emerge between the community and development agents and/or between members of the community. (Emmett, 2000: 505)

Recent studies of community water supply (CWS) projects in South Africa (Emmett, 2000: 505), are said to provide empirical support of the above analysis. These studies are said to have shown that community participation does not guarantee success, nor is there a correlation between the communities' sense of ownership of a scheme and its willingness to pay for the service. Problems and delays are said to have occurred during later phases of the project when conflicts and decreasing commitment to the projects took their toll.

It is argued that the potential conflict inherent in citizen participation is one of its major disadvantages (Clapper, 1996: 71). Brynard (1996: 42), argues that somehow it happens that there are a few principles and values on which the great majority of community members agree. Clapper (1996: 71) suggests that it is not always easy or possible to determine which goals are most important to all citizens in a community. Emmett (2000: 504) suggested earlier that even when the poor have interests in common, they may not be able to cooperate because of internal obstacles such as lack of trust. This is said to be tied in with the tendency within community-based approaches to have unrealistic expectations of the resources that the poor people have at their disposal (Emmett, 2000: 504).

2.7. Social Capital

The concept of social capital may help explain why some community-based projects fail while others succeed (Emmett, 2000: 509). It has already been argued in this paper that it is rational for community members to expect some kind of return on their investments of time and effort (social capital) in participatory projects. Emmett (2000: 509) argues that when such returns are not forthcoming, commitment to projects falters. This is said to raise the question of what conditions are necessary for community members to adopt more altruistic and cooperative approaches to pursue the public good rather than their narrow self-interest. From a social capital perspective what is necessary are the adequate levels of trust, obligation and networks of reciprocal engagement to ensure that

investments in the public good will be reciprocated by other community members in one or another (Emmett, 2000: 510).

The concept of social capital is said to have emerged from recent intellectual traditions that have attempted to find common ground between economic and social theory, and to transcend the reductionism of economic theory that recognises only one form of capital (Emmett, 2000: 508). The above author makes provision for three forms of capital, namely economic capital, social capital and cultural or human capital, although he believes that current conceptions of human capital are reductionist. Putnam (1992, 1993) is said to be concerned with the dilemmas of collective action and defines social capital as those “features of social organisation, such as trust, norms and networks that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions” (Emmett, 2000: 508). Social capital is seen as productive in that it facilitates cooperation and makes attainment of goals that could not have otherwise been achieved. Social capital does not however guarantee development because “if people can’t trust each other or work together, then improving the material conditions of their lives will be an uphill battle” (Emmett, 2000: 508).

While a common response of community-based development agents is to stress the importance of training (i.e. transfer of skills and capacities or human capital to poor communities), what is often not taken into account is that social and institutional deficiencies in the community may seriously limit the impact of that training. The point is articulated well by Dia (1997: 2);

“...the much lamented crisis of capacity building in Africa is more a crisis of institutional capacity (capacity utilisation) than the crisis of technical capacity (availability of skills, methods, systems and technology); ...this institutional crisis is essentially due to structural and functional ‘disconnect’ between informal and indigenous institutions built on the region’s history and its culture, and formal institutions mostly transplanted from outside” (Emmett, 2000: 509).

2.7.1 Social Capital and disgruntled citizens

As stated earlier in this paper, social capital is seen as presenting a potential development resource for local government. Internationally, the theory of social capital has triumphed and been used to promote the idea that associational life is a resource for better government performance (Harrison, 2002: 219). The White Paper on Local Government (1998) in South Africa also explicitly refers to the notion of social capital (RSA, 1998: 21). The South African scenario is said to require a different interpretation and application of social capital. Putnam (1993) considers the civil domain to be a critical one for government performance, and assumes that the public domain is the other player. Therefore, in its relationship to government performance, social capital is said to be salient only if citizens consider the local state as their reference point and if this collective action targets government (Harrison, 2002: 224). It will negatively impact government performance if the citizens have no trust in their local government and therefore do not participate in public forums. Social capital plays a significant role in assisting local government institutions in receiving inputs about their social environment, which is an important aspect in participatory development.

POWER RELATIONS AND PARTICIPATION

2.8 Power Relations

Eversole (2003: 791), argues that as much as the importance of 'participation' in local government has been acknowledged, understanding the power relations that affect participation in practice has lagged behind. He goes on to argue that in the complex social landscapes of local communities themselves, and in these communities' links to outside agencies, consultants, organisations, governments, and markets, lies the relationships which welcome or discourage participation (Eversole, 2003: 791). The concept of 'participation' is said to be too 'slight', on its own, to capture the real complexity of who participates in development and why. Eversole (2003: 791), argues that the important questions to ask are: what interests –whose interests –does a particular agency, group or individual represent?

2.8.1. Differences within communities

The notion of community, as mentioned earlier, has become associated with other referents such as class, race, and gender etc. Within communities there are many obvious differences. Parfitt (2004: 540), identifies four major axes of difference: age, gender, ethnic, or social group, and poverty; and notes that there are always others: of capability and disability, education, livelihood strategy, type of assets, and much else. Mohan (2001: 160), argues that participatory approaches have naively tended towards the view of that there is consensus within a community, and this conceals powerful interests at the intra-community level. The danger in doing this, from a policy point of view, is that the actions based on 'consensus' may in fact empower the powerful vested interests that dominated the participatory initiative in the first place (Mohan, 2001: 160). This could also result in decisions made generally favouring 'elites'.

Wilson (1999: 250), raises the question of whether local authorities are able to design participation initiatives to target different citizen groups and hence minimise social exclusion. He goes on to argue that the issue of social exclusion is particularly important in the participation debate (Wilson, 1999: 252). Patterns of social exclusion are seen as having the potential to be reproduced within participation initiatives. Cleaver (2001: 37), argues that a number of problems arise in analysing empowerment within projects, and that it is often unclear who is to be empowered –the individual, the 'community', or categories of people such as women, the poor, or the socially excluded.

The community is being more realistically seen as the site of solidarity and conflict, shifting alliances, power and social structures (Cleaver, 2001: 45). Various authors have illustrated the shifting, historically and socially located nature of community institutions, and the power dimensions of public manifestations of collective action (Cleaver, 2001: 46). There is also a recognition that the public participation of individuals may be negotiated and mediated within households and communities and shaped by prevailing social norms and structures, which is seen as raising critical questions about the scope of personal agency and the power of structural constraint (Cleaver, 2001: 51). Participatory literature in development is said to maintain oversimplified ideas about the beneficial

nature to individuals of participation, overlooking the potential links between inclusion and possible subordination.

2.8.2. Models of power, and participation

Wright and Nelson (1995: 7), argue that power is both experienced in encounters in everyday life and systems. Access to resources, control of the elements and processes of production, and rights to dispose of the products are experienced in face to face relations, but are also part of wider and systematic economic relations (Wright and Nelson, 1995: 8). These authors therefore argue that power is seen as a description of a relation, not a 'thing' which people 'have'. There are three models of power currently being used to analyse different aspects of participation, and they all convey different ideas about "what power is and how it is used" (Wright and Nelson, 1995: 8-11):

- The first model, which is often called 'power to', uses a metaphor, which suggests that like human abilities, power can grow infinitely if you work at it, and growth of one person does not necessarily affect another. Using this model, 'empowerment' starts from an examination of how power is present in multiple and heterogeneous social relations. In these relations individuals are simultaneously undergoing and exercising power: through which they are constituting their subjectivity and oppression. In such everyday encounters, individuals are both reproducing and challenging, or changing, systematic relations.
- The second model of power has been described as 'power over' and involves gaining access to 'political' decision-making, often in public forums. Marginalised people with an expanding sense of their ability to influence more aspects of their lives will soon encounter relations where control of resources has been institutionalised. The challenge for the marginalised group is to gain treatment as equal partners in a process of development from people in such institutions. The analyses of 'power over' view power relations as coercive and centred in institutions of government.
- The third model of power asserts that power is not a substance possessed and exercised by any person or institution conceived as a 'powerful' subject. Power is seen as subjectless and as an apparatus consisting of discourse, institutions, actors and

a flow of events. This is problematic as it does it can disguises relations within this apparatus.

2.8.3. Chamber's paradigm shift and power relations

Chambers (1995: 30), examines the view of a paradigm shift towards participatory development, and argues that reversing power relations is the key, and the weak link, in achieving participation. Chambers (1995: 30) advocates that there are three main ways in which 'participation' is used. First, he argues that it is used as a cosmetic label, to make whatever is proposed look good. Donor and governments require participatory approaches and consultants and managers say that they will be used, and then later that they have been used, while the reality has often been top-down in a traditional style. The second way in which participation is used, according to Chambers (1995: 30), is in a co-opting practice, to mobilise local labour force and reduce costs. The third, it is said to be used as an empowering process which enables local people to do their own analysis, to talk command, to gain confidence, and to make decisions (Chambers, 1995: 30). He goes on to argue that what this means is that 'we' participate in 'their' project, not 'they' participate in 'our' project.

Human society, according to Chambers (1995: 33), can be thought of as patterned into hierarchical relationships, by analogy described as North and South, and that many relationships are vertical, between 'uppers' and 'lowers'. For Chambers, individuals can be multiple uppers or multiple lowers, and a person can be an upper in one context and a lower in another. North-south, upper-lower, patterns can be thought of as a magnetic field, where the magnets are mutually reinforcing in orientation (Chambers, 1995: 34). In the normal strong North-South field, it is said that if lowers participate, it is in activities determined by the uppers. Chambers (1995: 34), therefore argues that participation, which empowers, requires a weakening of the magnetic field at various levels, with scope for lateral linkages with peers, colleagues, neighbours, and fellow citizens.

From the above, Chambers (1995: 39) argues that participatory approaches face many traps and problems. When looking at the issue of *who* participates, he notes that a pervasive problem is that of upper-upper biases, in which interaction tends to be with

local elites and with men, and missing the poorer and women. He goes on to argue that power relations can lead to mutual deception by uppers and lowers, an example being when uppers are told what lowers think they want to hear (Chambers, 1995: 41).

Kapoor (2002: 110), notes that Chambers appears to be taking a structural and relational view of power, seeing it located in multiple settings and being played out in the interactions between 'uppers' and 'lowers'. Kapoor (2002: 111) suggests that Chambers' assertion suggests that power can be minimised through dialogical and negotiated relationships. On the other hand, he suggests that Chambers' appears to endorse a more agent-centred view of power, which locates power in individuals who intentionally control and use it (e.g. for strategic purposes, to impose their will on others, etc.). Kapoor (2002: 112) argues that Chambers' adopts a negative view of power. Parfitt (2004: 543), says that Kapoor's commentary on Chambers' account of power is on the basis that Chamber's presents an 'undertheorised' account of power, and leaves out of account the insight that power is inevitably embroiled with the formation of knowledge.

2.8.4. Community participation and the state

Midgley (1986: 145), argues that earlier conceptions of community participation which found application in centralised and bureaucratically administered community development programmes have been translated into new rhetoric of community participation in social development. He also notes that the new concept of community participation involves an aggressive critique of existing power structures while requiring a far more direct role for ordinary people in deciding matters affecting their welfare (1986: 146). He also adds that many community participation theorists rejected state involvement, and are opposed to the idea that the state can contribute effectively to the promotion of community participation (1986: 146). It is argued that ignoring the role of the state in any discussion of community participation would be a serious omission.

Emmett (2000: 513), in addressing the issue of the role of the state, quotes Midgley (1986), who put it that, "the idealism and rhetoric of the concept of authentic participation needs to be tempered with a realistic assessment of the possible." Midgley (1986: 158), goes on to argue that:

"If the critical problems of mass poverty and deprivation in the Third World are to be dealt with, concerted action by the state will be needed. Local people do not have the resources to solve these problems through their own efforts alone... Participation is highly desirable but the poor cannot survive on rhetoric and idealism."

Against this backdrop, Midgley calls for a more realistic and appropriate concept of participation based on a closer relationship between the state and civil society. Emmett (2000: 514), "concludes that while it is not a 'magic bullet', state-society synergy lies at the heart of development success." Evans (1996), distinguishes between (a) synergy based on complementarity involving mutually supportive relations between government and citizens, and (b) synergy based on social ties between government and civil society (embeddedness) (Emmett, 2000: 514).

Stiefel & Wolfe (1994: 212), argue that any government attempt to translate principles of participation into practice brings to the surface various contradictions. On the one hand, governments face pressure from international forces to apply more participatory and democratic policies. They are also tempted by the opportunity to transfer responsibilities and costs downwards and by the possibility of mobilising and harnessing new local resources through participatory approaches (Stiefel & Wolfe, 1994: 212). On the other hand, governments are said to understandably shy away from the power implications of participation and its inherent potential for social conflict. Stiefel & Wolfe (1994: 212), argue that governments are not neutral administrative bodies but political expressions of dominant social forces, and the poor and excluded are not part of these ruling forces and alliances. These authors go on to argue that quite normally, governments tend to resist any policy that entails the dilution of power and above all participatory approaches that aim to empower the hitherto excluded.

This natural tendency of power to concentrate and remain at the top is said to have been reinforced, in many Third World countries, by the historical circumstances of the immediate post-independence period (Stiefel & Wolfe, 1994: 212). It is said that large

state bureaucracies, were put in place to regulate and organise in order to maintain control, and had a distrust of autonomous initiatives from below. Stiefel & Wolfe (1994: 213), argue that even when states feel obliged, or tempted, to open spaces and encourage wider popular participation –because problems have become unmanageable, because government’s capacity to plan and implement coherent policies has been eroded or because international pressure grows –they will normally attempt to control such participation and channel it into well defined areas and forms. One can argue that these authors’ have a negative view of the role that the state plays, and can play, by going on to argue that “states and their agents are likely to retain control over basic decisions and resources and confine participation to the implementation and running of programmes and projects that have been defined without the people who are supposed to be the ultimate beneficiaries” (Stiefel & Wolfe, 1994: 213).

2.8.5. Gender Relations

Efforts to promote participation in projects, programs and policy consultation appear to offer the prospect of giving everyone who has a stake a voice and choice. But, as Cornwall (2003: 1325) argues, community-driven development, participatory planning and other fine-sounding initiatives that make claims of ‘full participation’ and ‘empowerment’ can turn out to be driven by particular gendered interests, leaving the least powerful without voice or much in the way of choice. Gaventa (2002) quoted in Cornwall (2003: 1325), suggests that with the shift in the participation discourse moving beyond beneficiary participation to wider questions of citizenship, rights and governance, addressing challenges of equity and inclusion have gained even greater importance. Claims to ‘full participation’ and ‘the participation of all stakeholders’ is said to all too often boil down to situations in which only the voices and versions of the vocal few are raised and heard (Cornwall, 2003: 1325).

The question of who participates and who benefits is said to raise awkward questions for participatory development. Mayoux (1995), notes that while seeking to avoid the pervasive slippage between ‘women’ and ‘gender’ in development, it is important to emphasise that the marginalisation or exclusion of women from participatory forums remains an issue. Taking into consideration the need for participation of crucial groups

such as women, argues that women, for a variety of reasons (such as level of education, domestic responsibilities, social pressure and practical constraints), have fewer opportunities to participate in public matters (Davids, 2005: 91). The author views women's social, political and economic marginalisation as deeply entrenched (2005: 91).

2.9 Conclusion

From the literature analysed in this chapter one can conclude that there is insufficient evidence to prove that development will be enhanced if people are actively involved in the participation process. Challenges to participation, such as power relations, diversity of communities, and limited capacity of municipalities to enhance participation, need careful attention. These challenges can and do often lead to the exclusion of certain groups within a 'community' and not all voices are heard.

<p style="text-align: center;">CHAPTER 3</p> <p style="text-align: center;">DEVELOPMENT OF DEMOCRATIC SOUTH AFRICAN LOCAL</p> <p style="text-align: center;">GOVERNMENT</p>
--

3.1 Introduction

Following the re-demarcation of municipalities and the first fully democratic local government elections in December 2000, South Africa's local government is said to be now facing its third wave of change since the advent of inclusive democracy in 1994 (Atkinson, 2003: 2). This third generation of change requires municipalities to live up to the high standards set by the 'developmental local government' paradigm. Many, if not most municipalities face many challenges in their attempts to fulfill their developmental mandate. The following chapter will be looking at South African local government, tracing its history and exploring how the transition to democracy led to the restructuring of local government vision, purpose and direction. Discussion will also take place around the apartheid urban policy, the process of transition, municipal demarcation and the new developmental local government. It will be interesting to note how the apartheid local government system had influenced the culture of public participation in all communities. Robinson (2008: 27) suggests that although much has changed in South African local government, significant continuities remain. The level of public participation in South African local government is said to have never been high. There are continuities in power relations, forms of domination and exploitation, capacity issues and even in routine elements of council activities.

3.2 History of South African Local Government

South Africa is said to have become a Union in 1910 in terms of the South African Act of 1909 which created a three-tier system of government (Cameron, 1999: 75). The introduction of provincial government in 1910 resulted in municipal government becoming, at least in part, a responsibility of provinces (De Visser, 2006: 57). Each province therefore enacted its own Local Government Ordinance as no single uniform system of local government existed for the country. In an effort to facilitate the implementation of apartheid policy, the central government further restricted local responsibilities and deconcentrated its own authority through regional offices. In this

context, local government wielded minimal power and was seen by the public largely as a service agency, rather than a tier of government (Tapscott, 2006: 3). The author goes on to suggest that this was reflected in the extremely low participation in what was supposed to be grassroots democracy, even in white areas (Tapscott, 2006: 3). First, the disempowerment of local government is said to have reduced democratic processes to a meaningless exercise. "The authority of municipalities was severely undermined, while thirdly, the excessive fragmentation of authority made coordinated planning in urban areas impossible" (Tapscott, 2006: 3). The above analysis forms the foundation in understanding how South African local government has never had high levels of public participation local level decision-making.

Local authorities were single-tier, multi-purpose authorities with both legislative and executive powers. The lack of a metropolitan form of government is said to have led to the fragmentation of urban areas, which caused disparities in the standards of service provision and expenditure, particularly on racial lines (Cameron, 1999: 76). The fragmentation in urban areas is seen in local authorities in the new democratic dispensation, and continues to pose challenges for the participatory process. White local authorities (WLA) were responsible for the administration of black areas until 1971 after which the government created administration boards to control the administration of black areas. These boards were created to further control black areas (Cameron, 1999: 77). These advisory bodies, namely Black Advisory Boards, Urban Bantu Councils and Community councils, were largely ineffective and served to deny black people of political rights at all levels of government (Cameron, 1999: 76).

It is evident that apartheid settlements were not designed for development but rather for separation and control considering that these settlements were mostly in the outskirts of cities, the furthest from work, services and facilities. This was even more the case in the rural areas or former homelands, which had little or no access to economic opportunities or basic services (Department of Constitutional Development, 1998a: 4). Rural areas were largely administered by systems of traditional leadership. The colonial, and later, the apartheid state used traditional leaders as agents to administer local government activities. Many traditional leaders are said to have become oppressive and that the

institution lost a great deal of legitimacy (De Visser, 2006: 57). Throughout the rest of (urban) South Africa, local government was even more racist, subservient, exploitative, illegitimate in nature and mostly non-developmental. Popular participation in local government was limited to protests against rent increases in the black areas and active resistance to the apartheid regime.

Separate racially-based Local Government became increasingly unacceptable to the black community as seen by the increased pressure against racial discrimination in during the 1980's. According to Swilling (1988: 193) reforms had been vigorously resisted by national trade unions and community organisations who were putting forward the fact that "the black majority were not demanding solutions, but rather the right to participate in the formulation of solutions." These reforms that were introduced involved local government policy changes that gave birth to illegitimate structures such as the Coloured and Indian Management Committees and the Black Local authorities (BLAs) (Ismail, 1996: 1). According to Ceasar (1999: 14), because blacks were not thoroughly consulted with and local institutions continued to be based on ethnic foundations, "the government initiatives at local government level suffered from all the deficiencies which characterised the reform process in general." The rejection and distrust of local institutions was entrenched during this period and the culture of participation was never well established.

The Republic of South Africa Constitution Act of 1983 replaced the Westminster system with a tricameral parliament which made provision for limited power-sharing for Coloureds and Indians (Cameron, 1999: 78). There were separate parliamentary chambers created for Whites, Indians and Coloureds which had the powers to decide on 'own affairs'. Although all three groups had the power to decide on 'general affairs' the dominant party in the White chamber retained overall control of general matters (Cameron, 1999: 78). The creation of the BLAs was also partially to compensate for the Blacks' exclusion from the tricameral system. However, a another challenge to these BLAs is the fact that no extra source of revenue was provided for these structures, which led to increased rent and service charges (Cameron, 1999: 79). The crisis of local government financing is said to have continued unabated into the 1990's. The capacity of

local authorities with regards to financial resources remains a challenge in the new municipal administration in the democratic paradigm. The National Government's attempts of restructuring local government during the 1980s resulted in increasing anger and protest among black communities as these institutions were seen as politically illegitimate. Without any contact between citizens and the state, there was little prospect that communities could be mobilised to participate in programmes of socio-economic development. In fact, there were few, if any, attempts to achieve this objective.

3.3 Local government transformation

The collapse of apartheid in South Africa meant the end of an authoritative regime: a regime that defined itself against the needs and wishes of the majority of the population. The apartheid policies which left towns and cities racially fragmented resulted in the skewed development of South African society (Ceasar, 1999: 12). One relevant aspect of South Africa's transition to democracy is said to be the fact that unlike most political systems that go through non-revolutionary regime transition, the transition occurred at the national and sub-national level simultaneously (De Visser, 2006: 60). Almost parallel to the central negotiations a process of negotiations about local government is said to have taken place. The 1990s saw major changes in South Africa's political landscape, most notably, the unbanning of major political organizations such as the African National Congress (ANC). The National Party (NP) then committed itself to negotiating a new constitution with all participating parties.

Multi-party negotiations took place in 1992 and 1993, which culminated in the passing of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa of 1993, which was known as the Interim Constitution (Cameron, 1999: 83). The power-sharing provisions in this Interim Constitution led to the Government of National Unity (GNU). In 1992, the ANC and the NP agreed to the formation of a Local Government Negotiation Forum (LGNF), which was representative of the statutory structures (national, provincial and local) of the time and the non-statutory structures led by the ANC-aligned South African National Civics Organisation (SANCO) (De Visser, 2006: 60). The LGNF was launched on 22 March 1993 and the agreements reached were translated into three measures: an agreement on

local government finances, a Local Government Transition Act (LGTA) and a chapter in the interim Constitution.

The LGNF was a major breakthrough for local government in South Africa. It was in this forum that the national debate about a transformed Local Government took place alongside the national negotiation process (White Paper on Local Government, 1998: 3). The LGNF provided a platform for the government and those in opposition to debate the form and the functions of the process of transition to the new local government. This forum, through collective bargaining and negotiations, is said to have paved the way for a relatively peaceful transition to a new democratic form of governance at local level (Ceasar, 1999: 20).

According to Cameron and Stone (1999: 85), the Local Government Transition Act (LGTA) arranged the democratisation process into three phases, namely:

- the Pre-Interim Phase: This phase commenced with the passing of the LGTA in February 1994 and was operative until the first local government elections. It involved the abolition of apartheid-based local government and its replacement by Transitional Local Councils (TLC) which integrated Local Government for different population groups.
- the Interim Phase: This phase started with the first local government elections which were held in 1995 and 1996 for members of the Local Transitional Councils. These elections replaced the appointed members of the TLCs with elected members.
- the Final Phase: This phase commenced with the implementation of the final constitutional model at local level which coincides with the next local government elections to be held in 2000 (White Paper on Local Government, 1998: 4). The changes regarding a fully transformed local government system are promulgated in the Local Government Municipal Structure Act of 1998.

3.4 Municipalities, demarcation and re-demarcation

It is important to understand the demarcation process and its influence on the current structuring of municipalities in the developmental state. The demarcation process led to the amalgamation of different and diverse communities which impacts on the

participatory process. The LGTA regulated the demarcation of local government boundaries and made provisions for the establishment of a local government demarcation board in each province. Municipal demarcation is said to have given effect to the ‘one city, one tax base’ cry, which was rallied during the course of the rent and service boycotts in the 1980s (Cameron, 2006: 76).

The process of establishing developmental local government in South Africa has entailed undoing the apartheid legacy (Ambert & Feldman, 2002: 3). In respect of this legacy, two main characteristics are emphasised. The first is said to be the segregation of residential areas based on racial classification, and the creation of racially-based local authorities (Ambert & Feldman, 2002: 3). The second entails the confining of black South Africans to labour reserves, in the former homelands and self-governing territories. The results of this included vast disparities in terms of service levels and housing standards within and between settlements. This meant that within the newly formed ward areas there were diverse groups of people and therefore different needs and interests.

An independent Municipal Demarcation Board (MDB) rationalised the number of municipalities in the country from 843 to 284, and the breakdown per category is:

Category A	6 – Johannesburg, Cape Town, Durban, East Rand, Pretoria, Port Elizabeth
Category B	232 (of which 8 were cross boundary local councils)
Category C	46 (of which 7 were cross boundary district councils)
Total	284
DMA's*	26 (of which 1, Kruger Park, falls in two provinces) *District Management Area

(Municipal Demarcation Board, 2000)

3.4.1 Challenges of Amalgamation

When analysing boundary demarcation Cameron (1999: 63) notes that “rationalisation of structures is often associated with a reduction in citizen participation, which can lead to apathy...” Larger areas in some metropolitan governments have been alleged to be too

remote for some citizens to access, and therefore unresponsive to citizen demands (Cameron, 1999: 63). It also emerged that because of the problematic conclusion of boundary demarcation, there was no consensus on what 'community' means and that there were often heterogeneous views within the same community (Cameron, 1999: 297). This of course would have negative effects on the participatory structures at local government level where it is often assumed that all community members show the same needs and interests. The principle of 'shared authority' in some of the district areas, which involved the division of powers and functions between Category B and C municipalities, made it difficult to promote development.

The local elections of December 2000 are said to have led to the emergence of strong majority party tendencies (Atkinson, 2003: 4). Many of the councillors are said to have been elected with little experience of formal local government and many are accused of being elected based on political patronage from the majority party. In the Free State, for example, the ANC Youth League had vetted candidates for the posts of municipal managers in all the municipalities in the province. As a result of these changes, the fragile skills base of many municipalities is said to have been eroded away. The reduction in municipal capacity came at an unfortunate moment when municipalities were required to amalgamate, were also undergoing political change, and were required by the Department of Provincial and Local Government (DPLG) to create Integrated Development Plans (IDPs) (Atkinson, 2003: 5).

3.5 Developmental Local Government

As stated by Cameron (2004: 2), South African local government has been transformed fundamentally over the past thirteen years from an apartheid system catering for the needs of a minority to a democratic dispensation. The post-apartheid government is said to have committed itself to "instituting wide-ranging participatory processes in the different spheres and institutions of governance in the country" (Houston *et al.*, 2001: 201). These attempts at introducing popular participation are evident in the policy formulation and planning processes of local government structures. Developmental Local Government is defined in the White Paper on Local Government of 1998 as "local government committed to working with citizens and groups within the community to find

sustainable ways to meet their social, economic and material needs and to improve the quality of their lives” (1998: 17). This means that municipalities are legally obliged to involve civil society in the formulation of municipal budgets, planning and developmental priorities.

3.5.1 The Legislative Framework for Developmental Local Government

Many authors conceive the new local government policy framework as, if nothing else, ambitious. Pieterse (2002: 3) goes on to argue that “it is a commanding, complex, forward-looking and optimistic manifesto to systematically realise a participatory local governance system that is at the heart of an intergovernmental effort to achieve democratic citizenship, integrated development, and reconciliation between the divided communities of South Africa.” There are various pieces of legislation that emphasise the new developmental local government in South Africa. Throughout this legislation community participation is highlighted as of utmost importance (Erasmus, 2000: 14). The most important legislation advocating for participation will be discussed in this section.

The Amended Local Government Transition Act (No. 97 of 1996) required municipalities to produce IDPs that are to “serve as the framework for mobilising and prioritising the use of developmental resources, and aligning internal capacity and systems with strategic development objectives. (Houston et al. 2001: 210)” The Municipal Structures Act (No. 117 of 1998) requires municipalities to engage in consultation with civil society by developing mechanisms to consult the community and community organizations in performing their functions and exercising their power – section 10 [3]. It is therefore apparent that local government has had two consistent themes: the developmental role of local authorities –planning, implementing and monitoring; and the obligation imposed on local authorities to consult with residents, communities and all stakeholders in the performance of their tasks.

3.5.2 The Constitution

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act No. 108 of 1996) specifies the objectives of Local Government as to (section 152):

- provide democratic and accountable government for local communities;

- encourage the involvement of communities and community organisations in the matters of local government to become developmental, and;
- structure and manage its administration, budgeting and planning processes to give priority to the basic needs of the community and to promote the social and economic development of the community.

3.5.3 The White Paper on Reconstruction and Development

The White Paper on Reconstruction and Development (1994) formed one of the bases of development in South Africa and had a big impact on development planning in local government (Erasmus, 2000: 15). The first two sentences of this document describe how the context of Integrated Development Planning (IDP) should function:

“The RDP is an integrated coherent socio-economic policy framework. It seeks to mobilise all our people and our country’s resources towards the final eradication of apartheid and the building of a democratic non-racial and non-sexist future”
(RDP, 1994: 4).

It is clear from the above that the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) envisioned the fundamental transformation of society by mobilising the people of South Africa and resources in an integrated and coherent manner to address the underdevelopment created during apartheid (Erasmus, 2000: 16). It is evident from the RDP White Paper that the groundwork was being set for a participatory development system that encouraged the involvement of ordinary. The RDP is consistent with developmental local government and encourages the strengthening of the capacity of local government to provide services and ensure that participation of members of the community. The RDP emphasised the developmental role of local government and concentrated on:

- integrating areas which were once divided under apartheid;
- strengthening the capacity of local government to provide services;
- ensuring a more equitable role for women; and
- encouraging meaningful participation by residents and stakeholders

(RDP, 1994: 22; Department of Constitutional Development, 1998: 18)

3.5.4 The White Paper on Local Government of 1998

The White Paper on Local Government (1998) is said to have given effect to the new constitution provisions for a complete transformation of the local government system. According to Moosa (1998: 5) quoted in Erasmus (2000: 17) “the White Paper on Local Government spells out the framework and programme in terms of which the existing local government system will be radically transformed.” According to the second section of the White Paper (1998: 17) the central responsibility of municipalities is to work together with local communities to find sustainable ways to meet the needs and improve the quality of their lives. The following aspects can be drawn from the above policy document, namely:

- that municipalities need to promote participation by actively encouraging and removing obstacles to participation;
- a commitment to work in partnerships with stakeholders e.g. business, trade unions and community based organisation; and
- the implementation of the IDP process to align financial and institutional resources behind agreed policy objectives.

(White Paper on Local Government. 1998: 17 & 36)

3.5.5 Participatory Planning

The South African Constitution, various policy frameworks embodied in white papers, and various pieces of legislation have expressed a clear commitment to increasing public participation in the planning processes of local government. However, as alluded to throughout this paper, participatory planning raises special problems and challenges in South African Cities. It has been highlighted that the task of urban political restructuring has encountered daunting obstacles such as the geographically fragmented nature of cities, the divided political and institutional heritage of white and black towns and the resultant difference in political cultures which took hold in white and black areas respectively. An important part of developmental local government has been the introduction of integrated development planning. All meetings where IDPs are being tabled must be open to the public and the media. Local municipalities have to use IDPs as a method to plan future developments in their municipal areas. Ideally, ward committees are meant to be the primary channel through which communities are able to participate in

the affairs of local government and should serve as one of the main mechanisms through which municipalities communicate information to the residents.

3.6 Integrated Development Planning

In 1998, the White Paper on Local Government of 1998 clarified the role of the IDP and it was presented as one of the most important tools for municipalities to fulfill their developmental mandate. The Municipal Systems Act lists the rights and duties of the municipal council and the rights and duties of the local community respectively. The Act is said to instruct municipalities to develop “a culture of municipal governance that complements formal representative government with a system of participatory governance” (Municipal Systems Act, Section 16: Chapter 2). According to the Act, the integrated development planning process is intended to be the cornerstone of any municipality’s activities (Municipal Systems Act, Section 2.2). Citizen participation is therefore a fundamental element of the IDP process in which the community has to be consulted on development needs and priorities.

The municipality must have a document that sets out how it intends to go about drafting, adopting and reviewing the IDP, which is usually termed the ‘process plan’. The ‘process plan’ must allow for the local community to participate in the drafting of the IDP in order to establish community needs and priorities (De Visser . 2006: 104). The issues raised by the community can range from maintenance backlogs, the existence of poorly serviced areas, problems experienced with service delivery, local economic development, etc. The development needs then have to be prioritised in consultation with the community.

De Visser (2006: 104) argues that these activities translate into two participatory processes. The first being ‘micro-process’, involving the community in assessing their needs, which can be done at the lowest level, preferably the ward level. The ward committees, where they exist, are said to be a critical vehicles for conveying the needs of the ward to the council (De Visser, 2006: 104). The second process is referred to as the ‘macro-process’, where the community is consulted on the prioritisation of needs throughout the municipality. When the final draft is complete, the local community should then be able to comment on it before it is submitted to the council for adoption.

Once the plan is adopted, the municipality has to inform the public and copies made available for inspection.

The Development Bank of South Africa (DBSA) does however acknowledge that IDP represents a challenge to local authorities who, prior to 1994, were concerned mainly with service delivery and the implementation of regulations (2000: 4). It is also argued that “the public participation proposals in the IDP regulations are a typical example of an overzealous piece of legislation that has missed any practical relevance” (De Visser, 2006: 106). The mixture of soft law, general principles of citizen participation and detailed regulation in the municipal systems Act is said to be awkward and undermines the strength of the general principles that the Act should have been limited to. This is because some requirements of the Act are far too detailed and often deprive the municipality of the opportunity to devise other creative ways of facilitating citizen participation (De Visser, 2006: 106). .

3.7 Ward Committees

According to Craythorne (1993:106), the ward system first emerged in South Africa in 1786 in the Cape as a result of the Cape Burghers who were pressing for a greater share in the government of the Colony. This body, which was later given municipal and policing functions, is said to have evolved over the years into a form of contact between the people and the municipal commissioners. This system, which was for years appropriate for one side of the population was soon rejected and opposed by the African population. With the advent of democracy, and the division of the country into wards, these structures were revisited and formalised (Putu, 2006: 9). The new notion of wall-to-wall local government means that every South African will have direct access to a democratically elected representatives involved in the management of their local area (Parnell et al. 2002:83) This was made possible by the legislation governing local government. Ward committees were given new meaning, roles and functions.

The Municipal Systems Act (No. 32 of 2000) states that the objectives of a ward committee are to enhance participatory democracy in local government. These committees can therefore be seen as a means to enhance constructive interaction between

municipalities and local communities. Holland (2003: 21) goes on to argue that this interaction is governed by certain rights and duties set out in Sections 4 and 5 of the Municipal Systems Act, which outline citizens' rights to: submit oral or written complaints to the municipality; to prompt responses to those communications; and to be informed of decisions of the municipal council. While members of ward committees are supposed to be elected from a wide pool of interest groups, clear policies on the election process for ward committees is said to be lacking. Chapter 4 (part 4) of the Municipal Structures Act (No. 117 of 1998) obliges municipalities to make rules regulating the procedure to elect members of the ward committee. This chapter also provides a framework for the powers and functions of the ward committees, their term of office, how to deal with vacancies, and dissolution of the ward committees (Putu, 2006: 17).

The role of ward committees is to make sure that the electorate directly participate and partake in decisions made by council (Nyalunga, 2006:044). Ward committees are meant to be set up so that they can reach most sectors and areas in the ward. However, as much as the ward committees' main task is to communicate and consult with the community in respect of development and service plans, it has no formal powers to force the council to do anything. Ward committees are defined as "community elected area based committees within a particular municipality whose boundaries coincide with ward boundaries" (Putu, 2006: 9). They are chaired by the Ward councilor and composed of community members and, as mentioned earlier, are advisory bodies to the municipal council. A ward committee is made up of not more than 10 members.

The 10 elected people should represent a diversity of interests in the ward and be equitably representative of women. Diversity has typically been understood to mean a variety of representation, e.g. civic or rate-payers bodies, development organisations, labour unions, business associations, transport and commuter associations, women, youth, faith-based, cultural and other organizations. Members are elected by communities residing in the ward area. The Council, however, makes the rules for electing Ward Committee members. The nomination and election of ward committees has mostly been conducted in an informal way. As a result, the outcomes varied and it is not possible for municipalities to claim that ward committee legitimacy is based purely on voter turnout

and the rigour of the election process. At the same time we must be aware of the conditions under which many municipalities operate and the resources at their disposal.

3.8 Conclusion

Discussion took place around the apartheid urban policy, the process of transition, municipal demarcation and the new developmental local government. It is evident from the text that there was no culture of public participation even in the White municipalities. It has to be noted that there were no forms of participation institutionalized into local governance. It is also evident from the above discussions that the development of South African local government, from and during the period of apartheid, has had a significant influence on the functioning of local government processes particularly the effectiveness of participatory processes. There are clear continuities identifiable in local government functioning from the old regime to the new democratic paradigm. Communities remain highly fragmented, party political influence plays a significant role, and the culture of public participation in local government structures remains limited. Municipalities remain with inadequate capacity to deliver on their mandates, especially in the former black areas and townships.

<p style="text-align: center;">CHAPTER 4</p> <p style="text-align: center;">RESEARCH FINDINGS ON PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AT LOCAL GOVERNMENT LEVEL</p>

4.1 Introduction

Participatory mechanisms are highly contested: in form, content, limit, extent, politics, ideology, and unequivocally in practice in their implementation in the context of the everyday ways in which communities organise themselves and in which local government operates at the neighbourhood and city scales (Oldfield, 2008: 487). Two important questions therefore arise in relation to analysing participation: firstly, the levels of engagement by citizens in local government and secondly its effectiveness (Hemson, 2006: 3). Based on the literature on IDPs and Ward Committees, it is evident that there is limited public participation in local government structures that have been created for that purpose. It is argued that for the efficacy of community consultation, participatory mechanisms should involve disadvantaged groups such as women, youth, the urban/rural poor, and the disabled in decision-making processes yet this is not always the case.

The limitation of meaningful public participation in these structures is perpetuated by political, sociological and administrative challenges at the local level. The challenges in relation to IDPs and Ward Committees, which will be discussed in greater detail in this chapter, range from: lack of funding, lack of secretarial support, poorly trained members, power struggles at the local level, political party influence and insufficient consultation/engagement with community members. The following chapter will critically discuss some of the key findings of various studies done, by various authors, to establish some of the challenges to meaningful public participation in local government structures, namely, IDPs and Ward Committees. The key challenges shall be grouped into three broad themes, namely: political, administrative/capacity and sociological.

4.2 Effectiveness of Citizen Engagement in South African Local Government

Revealing the consequences of superficial or cosmetic processes, Manor notes, “if ordinary people find that what at first appears to be an opportunity for greater influence

turns out, in practice, to be a cosmetic exercise – if they gain little or no new leverage – then they will feel conned and betrayed” (2004: 9). Sisk et al (2001: 163) pick up on this notion and note critically that: participatory approaches will founder if people believe that they are being used to legitimise decisions that have already been taken or that the results of their efforts will not matter in the long run. Citizens and civic groups will quickly recognize when a process is a mask for a top-down decision-implementation and when the views of participants are genuinely sought (Sisk et al., 2001: 163).

Some critics acknowledge that there are existing spaces for engaging with policy processes and that civil society needs to be better informed, positioned and active to engage with these. Hicks (2005: www.cpp.org.za) argues that only a privileged few have access to these spaces, which are not sufficiently advertised or accessible, particularly to marginalised groups. She goes on to argue that “attempts to facilitate community input are largely superficial, and do not tap into the *real* power-base where decisions are made” (Hicks, 2006). Most processes are said to present pre-determined positions and programmes for limited feedback or information-sharing only, or create opportunities for communities to raise concerns, and therefore make very little substantive difference to policy decisions.

The Centre for Public Participation and its research partner South African NGO Coalition (SANGOCO) conducted policy discussion forums in which it was clear that the above thinking was shared and supported by most civil society experiences. Representatives from sectoral civil society groups were invited to share their experiences of participating in government decision-making processes, and to provide recommendations for making these more accessible and empowering. Groups shared mixed experiences, with feelings of being sidelined and marginalised, excluded and disempowered (Hicks, 2005: www.cpp.org.za). These were occasioned by not receiving feedback on inputs made in processes, not seeing any recommendations being taken up or any impact from having participated and made input, being co-opted into participating in a process with a pre-determined outcome, being excluded from an “inner circle” enjoying privileged access to decision-makers and information, and not being recognized as ‘worthy’ of participating.

Groups reflected on power relationships at play in participatory processes and how this impacts on the process resulting in the kinds of experiences they shared. These were typified by unequal power relationships between politicians and bureaucrats, government and civil society representatives, those with access to information and resources and those without, those belonging to organised structures and those not, those who are viewed as educated and those not, urban and rural residents, men and women, and people with different abilities (Hicks, 2005: www.cpp.org.za).

Participants reflected that these unequal power relationships play themselves out in the policy arena, resulting in some issues not making it onto the agenda, the exclusion of some stakeholders, the rendering invisible of others, and the exclusion of many from that critical juncture where decisions are made. Participants noted that unless these power issues are surfaced and addressed through careful planning, collaboration and facilitation, they will continue to undermine participatory initiatives seeking to gain civil society input and buy-in.

These experiences and reflections from civil society stakeholders highlight that although there are legislative provisions for participatory mechanisms in place, this is not enabling civil society to participate meaningfully. Policy-makers are said to acknowledge the limitations of these mechanisms, which are seen as inadequate, inaccessible and disempowering, and that new approaches to community participation in planning and policy-making are required (Hicks, 2005: www.cpp.org.za). It is clear that simply creating new spaces, inviting people to meetings and collecting voices is not sufficient to empower citizens or bring about greater participation in – and commitment to – municipal planning, decision-making and resource allocation (McEwan, 2004).

Chipkin and Mafunisa (2005: 8) argue that municipalities are not ‘hearing’ the voices of local residents, especially the poor and suggest that the existing system of public participation is not working. The authors also suggest that there is a concern within and outside government about the problems of corruption, clientelism and nepotism as it affects local government. Several other factors are highlighted that are said to limit the effectiveness of the ward committee system. In rural areas, popular participation is said to

be discouraged by the fact that residents often have very long distances to walk to attend meetings. In other cases, it is said that “ward committees were seen to be initiatives of the ‘strongest party’ in a particular ward, such that opposition parties distanced themselves from it (DPLG, 2003: 8). Many ward committee members are said to harbour personal political aspirations, compete with other councillors, politicise development and sometimes wilfully mislead community members (Buccus and Hicks, 2008: 525). Compounding the situation is the fact that ward committees are sometimes seen as little more than ‘talk shops’ and have no authority or access to resources over which they decide. Afesis-Corplan’s research (2003: 15) shows that there is often no structured feedback between the council and the ward committees and that councillors experienced difficulty in trying to raise ward committee issues in their municipal councils.

4.3 Integrated Development Planning and Ward Committees in Practice

The DPLG (2005) argued that community participation remains a token process in some municipalities, and the voice of civil society is conspicuous in its absence (Todes et al., 2006: 4). It is further argued that while officials and councillors recognise the importance of participation, their commitment to it is usually reduced to fulfilling minimum statutory requirements (Todes et al., 2006: 4). A perhaps more important criticism is that “IDP’s, like other decentralisation processes, often overlook the fragmentation and disorganisation within civil society, assuming levels of organisation and capacity that do not exist” (Todes et al., 2006: 5). Thus, the voices that are heard are often not representative of all interests, especially those of the marginalised or disempowered. “Simply creating news spaces, inviting people to meetings and collecting voices is not sufficient to empower citizens or bring about greater participation in – and commitment to – municipal planning, decision-making and resource allocation” (McEwan: 2004).

Heller (2001: 144-147) refers to the ‘technocratic creep’ of South Africa’s integrated development planning and argues that the planning processes [in post-apartheid South Africa] have largely served as instruments for exerting bureaucratic and political control and contends that ‘the ANC’s technocratic concern with getting the instruments right has all but obviated efforts to build local democracy and build local participation.

According to Manor (2004: 5), participation mechanisms that are established to channel citizen input are not accessible to the majority population in societies characterised by inequality, particularly marginalised communities and sectors, and typically do not “automatically benefit poor people and groups that have long faced social exclusion.”

Ward committees are said to be a key component of community-based involvement – presenting both a solution and challenge. When there is reference to community participation in local government ward committees are seen as the vehicle for engaging communities in municipality decision-making. Hicks (2005, www.cpp.org.za), argues that many municipalities still do not have formal or functional ward committees in place and that “in municipalities where ward committees are operational, these are marked by uncertainty, and in some instances, chaos.” This largely stems from the fact that there appears to be no clear understanding of the role that ward committees are supposed to perform. Community members have certain expectations of their ward committee representatives, yet councillors have different expectations. It is said that there is no clarity on the roles of ward councillors as opposed to proportional representation (PR) councillors. There are tensions between ward committee members and ward councillors, and limited resources available to enable ward committees to function (Hicks, 2005, www.cpp.org.za).

4.3.1 Political Challenges

That parties are the most important actors in South African politics is a widely held view, especially given the alleged ‘dominant party syndrome’ associated with the ruling ANC (Deacon and Piper, 2006: 1). The above authors, in their study of ward committee politics in the Msunduzi Municipality, ask the question whether “ward committees offer an opportunity for the local community to engage, and hold accountable, officials and councillors independently of party agendas, or are they an innovation dominated by, and even advancing the interests of, the local party branch?” (Deacon and Piper, 2006: 1) “The design of ‘participatory governance’ at municipal level is said to explicitly eschew a partisan conception of local engagement between the municipal council and residents in

favour of a notion of community segmented sociologically (eg. youth, disabled, women) rather than by party” (Deacon and Piper, 2006: 1).

In their study, Deacon and Piper (2006) found Msunduzi ward committees to be poorly developed and thus of little relevance to council processes. “Further, with respect to those ward committees that were functional, we found the independent and effective operation of ward committees to be highly vulnerable to party control, although in different ways” (Deacon and Piper, 2006: 1). Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP) ward committees are said to have most closely manifested the pathologies of the ‘dominant party syndrome’ as ward committees were treated as extensions of party branches. Some African National Congress (ANC) ward committees were seen as more open but were often subject to intra-party factionalism and local competition. The Democratic Alliance (DA) ward committees were seen as reluctant to embrace the deliberative agenda prescribed by the ANC-dominated council. The study led to the conclusion that “party politics did colonise the role of ward committees, eroding much of their potential as mechanisms of elite accountability and responsiveness alternate to party competition, although not necessarily in ways imagined under the ‘dominant party syndrome’ view” (Deacon and Piper, 2006: 2).

Deacon and Piper (2006) established that local political dynamics impact on ward committee functioning. “Several ward councillors complained of indifference and disrespect of officials towards councillors, as well as the ability of ward councillors who were also members of the Council’s Executive Committee to reap special benefits for their wards” (Deacon and Piper, 2006: 10). Most concerning are those political dynamics associated with party competition as they constitute a major obstacle to the independent and inclusive operation of ward committees. There are three versions of political contestation or competition identified by the authors, namely: (i) inter-party competition, (ii) intra-party competition, and (iii) policy competition (Deacon and Piper, 2006: 10). Interparty competition refers mainly to IFP/ANC relations, and the fact that the different wards are subject to their respective party’s control. Intra-party factionalism is noted within the ANC (and also, though at a less extent, within other political parties).

“Illuminating in this regard were the descriptions of certain ANC ward councillors as ‘highly politicised’ and ‘friends of the mayor’ – reference to the Thabo Mbeki/Jacob Zuma factionalism in the ANC” (Deacon and Piper, 2006: 11). In this regard, policy competition summed up the tension between the DA and the municipal officials. Where the officials described the DA as uncooperative and ‘doing their own thing’ and several DA councillors described the municipality’s initiatives around ward committees as irrelevant to their committee members.

The implication of partisan ward committees is also said to extend beyond just undermining their independent role, but also directly impacts on the health of civil society, undermining its ability to engage the local council. “Precisely because ward committees draw on local social capital in their constitution there is the real possibility that partisan ward committees will serve to demobilise civil society, as well as stifle concerns and voices inconsistent with local party interests (Deacon and Piper, 2006: 13).

It is often said that South African society is highly politicised, which makes it difficult to have non political structures that are not affected by local politics. Recent research by Todes *et al* (2006) investigated the impact of IDPs on women in Kwa-Zulu Natal. Through the above research, it was established that civil society organisations are concerned about the apparent irrelevance of consultation processes in the face of excessive politicisation of development processes (Todes *et al.*, 2006: 7). Resource allocation is perceived to be politically determined and civil society organisations are said to despair at councillors’ dismissal of urgent community needs in favour of party politics. The above authors go on to argue that women’s interests can be subordinated to men’s interest or political opportunism, and that in both cases, the influence of local elites and patriarchal systems is evident (Todes *et al.*, 2006: 7).

In the research conducted by Piper and Chanza (2006) into the operation of ward committees in the Msunduzi municipality, local politics was one of the reasons given for the under-representation and under-participation of young people in ward committees

(2006: 21). The above authors investigated the operation of ward committees in the Msunduzi Municipality, which includes the city of Pietermaritzburg, in KwaZulu-Natal, during 2005 and early 2006. In an interview with the councillor for Ward 26, he pointed out that he had no control on who got to be part of the ward committee. According to this councillor it was up to the community to elect or nominate members of the committee. Further, a young ward committee member argued that party politics limited the chances of young people making it to ward committees. According to Piper and Chanza (2006: 21), a young man reported that: “when they recruit ward committee members they only take card-carrying ANC members... they do not choose young people... in fact they do not see us as young people.”

Piper and Chanza (2006: 22) offer more of the responses on the issue of the effect of local politics on youth under-participation and under-representation on ward committees as expressed by those interviewed. In addition, the Youth Unit was blamed for being party aligned, contrary to the views of the three members of the youth unit who argued that the Youth Unit was made up of all parties. Lastly, one respondent reported that a key reason for low participation was that hard work implied that one wanted the ward councillor's position. Even when young people to get an opportunity to participate and attempt to work hard, they are weary of being seen as competing for the ward councillors job.

Tshishonga (2007: 71) conducted a study on the challenges facing ward committees in enhancing local participatory governance. The research focused specifically on the eThekweni-Durban Municipality which is located along the eastern sea coast of South Africa and has a distinctive racial, language and ethnic mix, and political makeup. The research included interviews with municipal officials, councillors, ward committee members and community members in ten wards across the municipality (Tshishonga, 2007: 62). The author argues that party political bias has had a negative effect in the functioning of the participatory process with regards to the ward committees in the eThekweni Municipality. Community members interviewed are under the impression that, whenever ward meetings or workshops are called, the agenda is often influenced by the

party that the councillor is affiliated to (Tshishonga, 2007: 71). This will clearly have an adverse effect on the genuineness of public participation and engagement in decision making processes.

Garane (2008) in his empirical study of community participation in the Randfontein Local Municipality, analyses the performance of ward committees. The author concludes that ward committees were not representative of all the interests in the ward. "It emerged during the process of this research that the sector representatives in ward committees did not necessarily have a support base in the sectors that they ostensibly represented. This was because ward committee elections were not sector based, but through a public meeting, which might very well have none of the sectors represented, particularly because these public meetings were mostly organised by active local political activists (Garane, 2008: 93). What emerged from the above author's study is, yet again, the perception that ward committee elections are politically motivated and/or aligned and that the ward councillor is a political agent. The competitive behaviour in ward committees is said to be a result of individuals hoping to benefit individually from participating in these structures (Garane, 2008: 95).

Putu (2006: 30) in his study of participation in ward committees in the Rustenburg Local Municipality highlighted that there is conflicting interests between the councillors and ward committees. The author notes that in most cases, because ward committees are chaired by ward councillors, conflict erupted due to the fact that the Ward councillors wanted to satisfy their political mandate rather than improving the lives of citizens. This led to the control of ward committees and the participation process where the agenda for meetings was often politically influenced in the hands of politicians who came to signify barriers for effective involvement of ordinary citizens.

4.3.2 Administration/Capacity Challenges

Critics argue that the IDP processes are still far from achieving full community involvement in policy-making as stipulated in the legislation –they remain very much top-down, and communities are said to be merely allowed to comment on proposals developed by city officials rather than being invited to contribute to the content before its drafting. “Instead, the meetings are dominated by questions about the promises that are not realised and perhaps making a list of demands for the City” (Mohamed, 2006: 42). On the other hand, the IDP proposals which are presented to communities for consultation are complex and contain technical parts that are beyond the ability of the ordinary people to grasp. By grouping the issues to be discussed in this section under administrative and capacity challenges I would like to highlight that this includes, both: the inability and incapacity of municipalities to provide conducive environments for effective participation, and the inability and/or incapacity of local community members to effectively engage in participatory processes.

Putu (2006: 28), in his study of the public participation in ward committees in the Rustenburg Local Municipality, argues that there was no proper introduction of democracy at the grassroots level and that people simply do not know how to constructively engage with local government. The author refers to an apparent gap between the promise of enhanced participation through ward committees on the one hand, and the everyday realities of participatory politics in the other hand. He goes as far as arguing that most communities do not know that they have a pivotal role to play in the development of democracy and their own environment. Putu (2006: 29) highlights the poor education levels among the poor sector participants as one of the challenges to effective participation in ward committees in the Rustenburg Municipality.

The author reports that comprehension levels of the community, more especially in the villages, were largely below the levels of the issues that were normally requiring participation. Because development involves technical elements, “in some cases even the ward councillors could not publicly explain the development decision because they did not understand the technicalities” (Putu, 2006: 29). In the case of the Rustenburg

Municipality, many of the ward committee members such as ordinary people from the communities, youth, miners, housewives, including some councillors had very poor educational backgrounds (Putu, 2006: 29). Many found it difficult to contribute to the discussions as they had difficulty understanding the technical presentations done by the municipality. Although participation in the ward committee structures is on a voluntary basis there were often expectations of employment and when these were not realised there would be less interest to participate from local people.

Todes *et al.* (2006: 7), based on their study on participation in IDP processes in eThekweni, argue that in all municipalities the IDP participatory processes have become abridged over the last couple of years. They go on to argue that “extensive and well-intentioned processes have been reduced to exercise in legislative compliance or opportunities for political mileage” (Todes *et al.*, 2006: 7). It is also said that interactive and in-depth discussions have often been replaced by more easily organised public events, which tend to be dominated by presentations of technocratic information, and allow little opportunities for meaningful discussion. eThekweni NGOs are said to argue that the public events do not give people the opportunity to express their views, that people are not empowered to participate, and that facilitators do not adequately capture people’s contributions (Todes *et al.*, 2006: 7). These authors go as far as suggesting that, for many, the minimal participation techniques used in the IDP process demonstrates that the municipality is only interested in complying with national requirements rather than actively involving civil society in the development process.

Garane (2008) in his empirical study of the Randfontein Local Municipality which focused on the climate at local level with regards to community participation, highlights a few findings which attest to the challenges faced by local authorities in their participatory processes. The author, from his research, concluded that methods to achieve meaningful public participation in the municipality were largely ineffective. The research found that there were no structures in place, as instructed by the DPLG, to drive IDP processes. The ad hoc public meetings that did take place did not effectively influence the planning, and therefore, the decision-making processes (Garane, 2008: 93). The author does not

however elaborate on the reason why mechanisms were not in place in the municipality but it is further suggested in his research that the municipal administration was often inefficient and a constant source of frustration to ward councillors.

The Urban Sector Network (USN) (2001) conducted a case study of the integrated development planning processes of the Durban Metro, in which they highlight some key strengths and challenges regarding public participation in IDPs. The report starts by noting that IDP participation structures in the metro were not developed through an initial process involving existing structures and new role-players. What this resulted in was a situation where “processes were pre-designed and taken to communities for acceptance. (USN, 2001: 26)” There was also a case of a lack of administrative support in that there were challenges with distribution of published documentation, organisation of meetings, and funding for transportation costs. Many problems also arose due to participants in these meetings not being aware of the basics, such as where their local council boundaries lie, what the division of powers and functions are between local, metro, provincial, or what integrated development planning meant (USN, 2001: 27).

The lack of ongoing consultation is also cited as an issue in the above case study of integrated development planning in the Durban Metro. After the initial requirements of consultation in identifying needs were complied with, councils did not develop or work towards ensuring ongoing participation in the planning systems (USN, 2001: 27). Participation in monitoring and review processes was limited to publication of documents, which in most cases did not even reach the people. Because of the lack of planning for ongoing consultation future communication would be limited to these published documents which were made available at the councils and libraries. Although some publications, along with radio and newspaper publicity, allow for a period of comment, this does not constitute a participation process and should be taking place concurrently with an ongoing participation process (USN, 2001: 28). In general, according to this study, there seems to be a general disregard for the IDP process with some councillors sometimes not sticking to the priority strategies and pushing their own projects despite the IDP process.

Through the research done by Piper and Chanza (2006) into the operation of ward committees in the Msunduzi municipality, a lack of resources was identified as a significant influence in the under-participation and under-representation of young people on ward committees (Piper and Chanza, 2006: 22). A recurring notion by respondents, in the study by the above authors, was that being on a ward committee exists in some tension with steady employment. In addition, several respondents blamed the lack of financial support for ward committee work as an obstacle to youth participation (Piper and Chanza, 2006: 22). Notably, the majority of ward councillors interviewed (nine of out of fifteen), supported the need for more resources and incentives for members. The councillors complain of having to pay for their own travelling expenses in order to attend meetings and that they lack such basic materials as stationary.

Another issue that emerged repeatedly in the study was the issue of training for ward committee members. "There was a general agreement amongst those interviewed that training was both essential to ward committee functioning and insufficiently supplied by the municipality (Piper and Chanza, 2006: 22). Several respondents complained that they received no training at all or that training came too late, or that the training was insufficient in length and too general in content. One respondent went as far as to dismiss training as a political gesture and that rather than being meaningful, training workshops were held merely for the municipality to appear as living up to its mandate of facilitating participatory local governance.

Mohamed (2006: 40), argues that it is extremely difficult for members of a ward committee in an impoverished setting without any logistical means to be effective in engaging their communities. Most municipal councils provide administrative support to facilitate regular interaction between the ward committee, the ward councillor and the council, while ward committees lack capacity to communicate regularly with their communities (IDASA & Afesis-Corplan, 2005). This situation is said to reinforce the perception that ward committees are representatives of the municipality rather than their own community (Mohamed, 2006: 41). The above author goes as far as arguing that

while the ward committee system presents an opportunity to realise the aim of structured community participation in municipal affairs, it failed to provide informal settlement communities with the same opportunity. This failure is said to go beyond the functioning of the ward committee system to affect the participation of these communities in the IDP processes (Mohamed, 2006: 41).

From their study, Deacon and Piper (2006: 8) established that municipalities needed to support ward committees by institutionalising them. To achieve this, the municipality would need to: “(i) ensure the correct constitution of ward committees, (ii) train ward councillors and ward committee members, (iii) resource committees and, perhaps most importantly, (iv) clearly define the role of ward committees in council processes” (Deacon and Piper, 2006: 8). Eight of the twenty-one councillors interviewed talked of the ignorance of many ward committee members about how local government operates; and municipal officials referring to the ignorance of many ward councillors about how local government works. Resources are also said to have emerged as a major issue across race, space and party (Deacon and Piper, 2006: 9). Like in the study by Piper and Chanza (2006) on the lack of participation of young people, several ward councillors attributed the apathy of ward committee members to the fact that they were not paid, nor reimbursed. What also emerged in this study is the common appeal for office space and administrative support so that meetings could be efficiently organised, held and properly minuted (Deacon and Piper, 2006: 9).

It was established from the study of ward committees in the Msunduzi Municipality by Deacon and Piper (2006: 7) that without a councillor who is competent, well-organised and committed to the ward committee, the structure cannot operate. This is because the councillor is responsible for how often the committee meets, what it discusses, what information ward committee members acquire, and what information the council obtains from ward committees. In the Msunduzi case, there was evidence that “a significant minority of ward councillors were simply not up to the tasks, either because they were incompetent, ignorant of their responsibilities in respect of ward committees, or constrained by party political or local power contests (Gardner 2005, Mngadi 2006)

quoted in Deacon and Piper (2006: 7). It is said that in the case of Msunduzi Municipality, less than 50% of ward committees met regularly, and even amongst those that met regularly, the frequency varied widely, including weekly, monthly, bi-monthly and annual periods (Deacon and Piper, 2006: 8). Many ward councillors, which emerged from the study by the above author, were reported as co-opting new members as ward committee members left or stopped participating.

In the study conducted by Tshishonga (2007: 58) on the challenges facing ward committees in enhancing local participatory governance in the eThekweni Municipality the author notes that capacity building and training remain one of the challenges facing ward committee members in performing their duties effectively, listing:

- Insufficient skills in organising and running community based meetings;
- Lack of information regarding municipal policies and protocol;
- Inadequate support in the form of office facilities and equipment.

The above issues are also said to contribute to the demotivation felt by many ward committee members. This contributed to ward committee members not showing an interest in fulfilling their mandate as per ward plans and to their unwillingness to participate in workshops. Other challenges identified by councillors and ward committee members in Tshishonga's (2007: 72) research are in relation to the geography of some of the wards which at times disadvantages areas within the ward that are at the outskirts and which are not always accessible to ward committee members.

In her study of participatory democracy in the Johannesburg City Council, Bénit-Gbaffoue (2006: 7), suggests that one of the key limitations to the participatory process is the limited powers and lack of accountability of ward councillors. The limited power of councillors within the municipal council is said to be due to a strong centralisation of decision-making and policy orientation, which also leaves room for one-party domination to prevail (Bénit-Gbaffoue, 2006: 7). Councillors are also said to show limited accountability to their constituencies, due both to the municipal structure itself and to the

electoral system – and also, to a lesser extent, the novelty of the whole ward system being partially understood and used by residents.

4.3.3 Sociological Challenges

Recent studies of IDPs (Adam and Oranje, 2002 and Harrison, 2005) suggest that existing power relations, such as the dominance of local elites, the weakness of women's organisations and the subordinate position of women in the public sphere are likely to thwart the intentions of inclusive participation. In the case study conducted by The Urban Sector Network (USN) (2001: 27) into the integrated development planning processes of Metro Durban it also emerged that not all groupings within the municipality were equally able to participate. Marginalised groupings such as informal settlements, women, youth and the elderly are said to have, in many cases, not received appropriate support to attend meetings and were often marginalised.

Research by Todes *et al.* (2006) was conducted in three types of municipalities in the KZN province and in each municipality, interviews and focus group discussions were held with municipal officials and councillors, and representatives from women's civil society organisations (Todes *et al.*, 2006: 1). The three municipalities, eThekweni Municipality, Hibiscus Coast Municipality and Hibiscus Coast Municipality, which formed the basis of the study, show varying characteristics in terms of resources and practices. Through the research it has been established that in all three municipalities, women are not invited to participate in IDP processes as a distinct constituency. Public meetings are said to rely on attendance through broad based invitations, and municipalities use local media and loudhailers to broadcast the dates, times and venues of the meetings (Todes *et al.*, 2006: 5). This technique is said to have attracted several welfare organisations, but generally most women's NGOs did not attend. In rural Hibiscus Coast, older women are said to be more vocal than the youth, and that they raise issues and lead discussion, while in the urban areas, a smaller proportion of women attend and older men dominate discussion (Todes *et al.*, 2006: 6).

It is evident from the above study by Todes *et al* (2006) that the experience in municipalities in the traditional areas is one of low levels of organisation and activity around women's issues. The authors go further to argue that while poverty and excessive household demands reduce the time and the resources that women have at their disposal for community activities, the ideological burden of subordination and inferiority engendered by the patriarchal value system has a profound impact on women's perceptions of their rights, entitlements and the opportunities available to them, to realise them (Todes *et al.*, 2006: 8). Women's responsibilities tend to lie within the domestic sphere, in caring for their husband and children, and attending to household duties. Men are said to be involved in the public sphere, and are responsible for making decisions relating to the community at large and women are expected to follow them (Todes *et al.*, 2006: 8).

Patriarchal cultural values persist and women find it difficult to express their views. The authors go on to note that, even in eThekweni, women still need to be encouraged to talk, and usually women's voices are not as strong as those of men. "In Msinga, traditional protocols remain very strong and women are not expected to express their opinions unless they are asked specifically to do so" (Todes *et al.*, 2006: 6). It is as a result of this that women are reluctant to express their opinions, and rely on other people to raise their concerns as a sign of respect to the male leadership. Generally, IDP Representative Forum meetings are said to have a desultory record, with very limited attendance by women.

Ward Committees have been identified as the most important structure through which to involve communities in local government in South Africa. Moreover, the law requires that a special effort be made to include young people as ward committee members and in the activities of ward committees. Research was done during the 2001-2006 term of office, by Piper and Chanza (2006) suggests that young people are under-represented in ward committees and under-participate in ward committee activities, with the result that youth issues remain mostly ignored (Piper and Chanza, 2006: 18). Some of the reasons given for this include local political dynamics, the under-resourcing of the ward

committee system but, most notably, the attitudes of some older people who see youth as 'too raw' for government. It was also established that, in total, young people made up just 26.8% of ward committees of the 15 ward committees interviewed, or 40 of 149 seats, despite averaging 41% of the population of these wards, which clearly shows under-representation of young people.

Gervais-Lambony (2006: 1), in his study of the influence of territorial construction at the ward level in South African cities, looks at the influence and the use of space in the political identity constructions in the ward level of the Ekurhuleni Metro. The main focus of the above author's study was on the relation between space (including absolute space, lived space and representations of space) and local democracy in an urban context. In the context of this thesis' research, the author's findings help to illustrate that: communities are highly diverse and that in some aspects diversity is recognised and given political space for expression; but some identities are not accepted, and among these, territorial identifications internal to the wards are treated with ambivalence (Gervais-Lambony, 2006: 3). This can have, and in the context of the Ekurhuleni Metro has had, negative implications for meaningful and effective public participation in local government structures such as the ward committees. It has resulted in some voices going unheard and has also led to the domination of the process by political players and interests. Also apparent in the research findings is the spatial problem of different areas and extensions being far from one another and there being limited mobility from one to the other (Gervais-Lambony, 2006: 7).

Another issue of concern is therefore the diversity of wards themselves considering the spatial structure of the apartheid city. According to Garvais-Lambony (2006: 5), in his study of ward areas in the Ekurhuleni Metro, the difference between wards and internal diversity in each ward is very high. By its purpose the ward committee system is suppose to accommodate diversity and to be non-political. This task becomes difficult when areas have different problems, so different expectations leading to this diversity of local identities (Gervais-Lambony, 2006: 7). A secondary issue to that of diversity becomes a spatial problem where you find that different areas and extensions are far from one

another. As the above author highlights “for the local democratic, the question of where to organise public meeting is central” (Gervais-Lambony, 2006: 7). These are some of the challenges to the public participation processes that will be discussed in this chapter.

In 2000, a new political and administrative shift was launched which saw the creation of the Ekurhuleni Metro and the inhabitants of Vosloorus now had to identify themselves at the metro level. Because of the spatial structure, the township wards had to integrate formal township areas (themselves diverse), hostels and informal settlements (Gervais-Lambony, 2006: 5). Although electoral results showed a very strong dominance of the ANC in the 5 wards that made up Vosloorus, in reality, the difference between wards and internal diversity in each ward were very high. What the research further indicated was a contradiction, in that: there was an important dimension to diversity in the wards, but the representation of local society in the ward committee was purely sectoral. “The spatial, social and cultural fragmentation of the inherited city is not only between former group areas, but internal in wards as well. (Gervais-Lambony, 2006: 11).

Mohamed (2006: 40), in his article on the involvement of informal settlement communities in policy-making at city level in South Africa, also highlights the confusion surrounding the role of the ward committee and the inability of these committees to operate because of some of the challenges they face. As stated earlier, the objective of a ward committee is to enhance participatory democracy in local government, and to do so by creating a formal and unbiased communication channel between the municipality and the community within the ward; facilitating public participation in the processes of the IDP, and acting as an advisor to the ward councilor. Disadvantaged sectors of the urban population, such as informal settlement communities, are often isolated from the processes of policy-making mainly because informal communities are not recognized as a disadvantaged group in the city (Mohamed, 2006: 45). This often leads to situations where these communities are not represented in the ward committees. It is critical when developing inclusive policies for the future development of urban areas, to include all communities.

Putu (2006: 30) in his study of participation in ward committees in the Rustenburg Local Municipality the author also highlights the conflict that arose between traditional leadership and the municipality as another challenge to the participatory process. The author argues that “control by the municipality over the decisions about the nature and structure of the participatory channels restricted and undermined the influence of the traditional authorities” (Putu, 2006: 30). Certain powers of traditional structures are said to have been taken away and granted to the Ward councillor and ward committees. The resultant frictions that emerged between the traditional leaders and the democratically elected leaders led to a hostile environment for meaningful participation to take place.

4.4 Findings

The literature analysed covers a broad range of areas in its assessment of the effectiveness of public participation in IDPs and ward committee structures across South Africa. Randfontein Local Municipality and Ekurhuleni Metro in Gauteng; and Durban Metro, Hibiscus Coast Local, Msinga Local and eThekweni Metro in Kwa-Zulu Natal, Rustenburg Local Municipality in the North West. The most important thing to note is that the research has been theme-based rather than focusing on each municipality in detail. The objective is to highlight the broad trends across the board.

The three key challenges to meaningful public participation in IDPs and Ward Committee structures:

Political Challenges

It is evident from the case studies that IDPs and Ward Committees function in very politicised communities, which tends to lead to the politicisation of the participatory process. Resource allocation is also seen as politically determined. The participatory process is sometimes dominated and influenced by local elites in an environment where there are competing interests and a drive for accumulation of power. Local politics and party politics dominate the election process for ward committee membership, which leads to the vulnerability of ward committees to party control. As in the case of Msunduzi, there is also intra-party factionalism affecting the performance of committee processes. Because ward councillors are seen as political agents, the agenda for the meetings is seen

as politically influenced. These are some of the political challenges facing ward committees and the integrated planning process.

Administrative Capacity Challenges

Participatory meetings involving community members are dominated by technocratic information by consultants, which results in there not being any meaningful discussion. In many instances, people's views were not adequately captured. The IDP processes is seen as too top-down with proposals developed by city officials and brought to the community for rubber-stamping. In most instances no resources are allocated by the municipality for public participation resulting in inadequate facilities and equipment for ward committees. Public participation is in most cases not structured and implementation was fragmented. There are challenges with the distribution of feedback documentation, organisation of meetings, and funding for administrative costs such as transport. Because of the far distances of areas between wards, it is also a challenge for community members from areas in the outskirts to reach meetings in the urban areas. As far as the capacity of ward committee members is concerned, most members lack adequate training on how local government works, and have insufficient skills in organising meetings. There are also challenges with the institutionalisation of ward committees within the municipalities as roles and responsibilities are not clearly defined. It is also clear that ward councillors have limited power or influence and are accountable to municipalities and not to communities, which resulted in a lack of ongoing consultation with community members.

Sociological Challenges

The key finding with regard to sociological challenges is that marginalised groups such as women and the youth are often excluded from participatory processes and their needs are not always prioritised. The diversity and socio-economic differences of communities has also had a negative impact on the effectiveness of participatory processes. There are clear territorial identifications and diversity is not always recognised and some voices often go unheard. The weakness of some women's organisations and patriarchal cultural systems are examples why women's voices often go unheard. One can clearly see the power relations that are at play at the local level between the different groups within municipal areas. It has been highlighted in this paper that under-representation and under-

participation of certain groups in the participatory process is not beneficial to meaningful participation. And in most cases people's concerns and interests are not reflected in IDP documents and/or raised in ward committee engagements. The participation of women in these processes is also limited by the demand on their time away from performing their household duties.

4.5 Conclusion

The above chapter has captured the key challenges to meaningful participation of citizens in participatory processes at the local level. The case studies cited provide a broad overview of some of the challenges, which have been grouped into three broad categories, namely: political, administrative/capacity, and sociological. It is evident from the findings that public participation at local government level is limited, and even when it does take place it does not it is not always effective and citizen's concerns do not reach the municipal and/or integrated plan agenda.

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION

Widespread disillusionment with the performance of municipalities has become increasingly apparent, as the population lose trust in the institution of local government and appeal to higher levels of government for assistance. The recent nationwide protests against poor service delivery at local government level reflect the concerns of a citizenry which is growing tired with the rhetoric of participation and empowerment without any material gain. Citizens have now created their own popular spaces for participation which entail mass protest, with sometimes violent overtones (Tapscott, 2006: 13). The extent to which communities embrace the notion of local governance is likely to be determined by the degree to which local authorities have the capacity to fulfil the responsibilities assigned to them. From the literature it is evident that local authorities do not have the capacity to operate functional and effective participatory structures. Most of the municipalities mentioned in this paper are currently not meeting their statutory requirements.

In the rush to address political imperatives for the delivery of services, the building of infrastructure and the consolidation of the post-apartheid state, energy and resources have focused on the physical elements of delivery of development. In this all-consuming attention to 'deliverable' physical development, less tangible and measurable democratic processes to build inclusion have become side elements, narrow channels through which society is directed to participate with government (Oldfield, 2008: 488). In general, while case study research acknowledges that the level of participation has never been higher in South Africa, given the history of exclusion during apartheid, it suggests that public participation in local level planning processes has been rather superficial. Other problems are around resources and capacity and political party manipulation of the participatory structure and processes.

The focus of this thesis has been on analysing public participation in local government in South Africa. Particular attention was given to *Integrated Development Planning* and *Ward Committees*, prominent platforms of public participation at local government level. My research objectives were to assess how successful these structures have been in

enhancing meaningful participation of the public in decision-making. This was done through a critical analysis of public participation in IDPs and ward committees in South Africa's local government in the period post-2000 to date.

It is evident from the discussions in chapter two that definitions of participation share the view that development will be enhanced if people are actively involved in the decision-making processes. The issues discussed however show that there are challenges to participation which need careful attention such as power relations, diversity of communities, and limited capacity of municipalities to enhance participation. As much as there are proponents for participation, there are equally critics of its processes. Power relations, specifically in relation to public participation, play a significant role in the participatory process in South African local government. A strong party system also came out as an impediment to effective public participation in the South African context.

Discussions on the development of South African local government show that there was no culture of public participation even in the White municipalities. Development of South African local government, from and during the period of apartheid, has had a significant influence on the functioning of local government processes particularly the effectiveness of participatory processes. There are clear continuities identifiable in local government functioning from the old regime to the new democratic paradigm. Communities remain highly fragmented, party political influence plays a significant role, and the culture of public participation in local government structures remains limited. Municipalities remain with inadequate capacity to deliver on their mandates, especially in the former black areas and townships.

Chapter four captures the key challenges to meaningful participation of citizens in participatory processes at the local level. The case studies and literature reviewed provides a broad overview of some of the challenges, which have been grouped into three broad categories, namely: political, administrative/capacity; and sociological. It is evident from the findings that there has been some public participation taking place at the local government level it is however limited. When it does take place it is not always effective and citizen's concerns do not reach the municipal and/or integrated plan agenda.

It is clear that if planning is to challenge socio-political inequality, then a far higher level of social mobilisation is required – government must be constantly called to account, and the voices of the socially marginalised must have weight (Harrison, 2008: 334). The culture of public participation in a democratic decentralised local government environment has not yet been established in South Africa. The good intentions and the foundations laid by the South African Constitution (1996) and numerous Acts and White Papers regarding public participation, will not, per se, create a culture of public participation. Policy guidelines serve merely as a vehicle for the introduction of public participation will only become a reality if the public becomes the primary actors in establishing the required culture. It is also not clear whether all municipalities have prioritised and implemented an integrated development “ethos” in their thinking and planning interventions.

The success of participation at the local level also depends on the manner in which participation is conducted. It becomes very difficult to have democratic structures operating under undemocratic lines as it is only in through democratic practice in these structures that true and meaningful participation can be fostered. Participation is about being able to shape politics and influence policy and it therefore requires a move away from just being present at meetings, but the public needs to be actively consulted, welcomed, respected and listened to. It also becomes difficult to engage when communities are not at the same level of understanding with officials and councillors and are not conversant in local government processes and technical developmental issues.

Before one can start analysing the developmental impact of participatory development and planning, one has to establish whether the participation is indeed taking place. This research paper has attempted to do that, albeit at a broader scale. There needs to be, for the purposes of future research, a detailed empirical study of all the municipalities in South Africa in order to observe what challenges are faced across the board. The research would have to take both a quantitative and qualitative direction in order to assess in numbers how many people are participating in local government processes and to also

establish what people's feelings are of the participatory process. This would then allow for the making of informed conclusions and decisions about the effectiveness of public participation at a local government level. The pockets of research and studies explored in this paper are not sufficient to make sweeping conclusions of the situation in the whole country. The research would have to involve all key stakeholders, namely: municipal officials, ward committee members and councillors, civil society organisations and members of the public. Following the above proposed study one could therefore start analysing whether where participation is taking place, is it having a direct influence in decision-making and are ordinary people's interests and concerns reflected in development plans and ward committee agendas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adam, A. and Oranje, M.. (2002) *Report on engagement with District Municipalities and Metropolitan Municipalities*. Report to the Municipal Demarcation Board.

Afesis-Corplan. (2003) *Municipal governance: Working of Ward Committees. an evaluation of the implementation of ward committee system since December 2000 as an effective interface between municipalities, civil society and communities*. Research commissioned by Organisation Development Africa (ODA). East London: Afesis-Corplan.

Ambert C. and Feldman M., (2002). *Are IDP's Barking up the Wrong Tree? A Story of Planning, Budgeting, Alignment and Decentralisation*. In paper presented at the South African Planning Institution Planning Africa Conference 2002. Durban. South Africa.

Atkinson, D., (2003) 'Post-apartheid Local Government Reforms: A Small Town Perspective.' The Centre for Development and Enterprise, *Occasional Paper* No. 8. March.

Bénit-Gbaffou, C. (2006) 'Holding local government accountable? Civil Society, Ward Councillors and Decision-Making in Johannesburg' in paper presented at *The Place of Participation in a Democratising South Africa: Decentralisation, Local Councillors and Civil Society in Post-Apartheid Cities* Johannesburg: Wits University, 20 – 21st November 2006.

Booyens, S., (2005) *The Challenges of Local Democracy*. Johannesburg: ACNielsen.

Brynard, P. A., (1996) 'Realities of Citizen Participation' in K. Bekker (ed.), *Citizen Participation in Local Government*, Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Brynard, D. J., (1996) 'Planning: the Participatory Approach' in K. Bekker (ed.), *Citizen Participation in Local Government*, Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Buccus, I. and Hicks, J., (2008) "Democratisation with Inclusion: Revisiting the Role of Ward Committees" in *Consolidating Developmental Local Government: Lessons from the South African Experience* eds. Mirjam van Donk, Mark Swilling, Edgar Pieterse, Susan Parnell), Cape Town: UCT Press.

Butterfield, J., (2005) 'South African Democracy and Local Participation' in Davids, I., (ed.) *Voices from Below: Reflections on Ten Years of Public Participation: The Case of Local Government in the Western Cape Province*, Cape Town: Foundation for Contemporary Research.

Cameron, R.G., and Stone, A.B., (1995) *Serving the Public*, Pretoria: J.L van Schaik.

Cameron, R., (1999) *Democratisation of South African Local Government: A Tale of Three Cities*, Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Cameron, R., (2004) 'South African Local Government: The Limits of Institutional Reform?' paper presented at the *Hurst Seminar on Reform and Democracy in Local Government of Countries in Transition*, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Beer Sheva, Israel, May 23-24, 2004.

Cameron, R. (2006) 'Local Government Boundary Reorganisation' in Udesch et al. (eds.) *Democracy and Delivery: Urban Policy in South Africa*, Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Ceaser, N., (1999) *Assessing the Attitudes and Perceptions of Councillors and Officials on Integrated Development Planning: A case study-the Municipality of Stellenbosch*, University of Stellenbosch MPA Thesis.

Chambers, R., (1995) 'Paradigm Shifts and the Practice of Participatory Research and Development' in Wright, S., Nelson, N. (eds.), *Power and Participatory Development: Theory and Practice*, London: Intermediate Technology Publications.

Chipkin, I. (1996) Contesting Community: The Limits of Democratic Development. *Urban Forum*, 7 (2): 217-31

Chipkin, I. and Mafunisa J., (2005) *Ten Year Review of Local Government*, Pretoria, HSRC.

Clapper, A. V., (1996) 'Advantages and Disadvantages of Citizen Participation' in K. Bekker (ed.), *Citizen Participation in Local Government*, Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Cleaver, F., (2001) 'Institutions, Agency and the Limitations of Participatory Development' in B. Cooke & U. Kothari (eds.), *Participation: The New Tyranny?*, London & New York: Zed Books.

Cornwall, A., (2000) *Making a Difference? Gender and participatory Development*, IDS Discussion Paper 378, UK: Institute for Development Studies.

Cornwall, A., (2003) 'Whose Voices? Whose Choices? Reflections on Gender and Participatory Development' *World Development*, Vol. 31 (No. 8): 1325-1342.

Cooke, B., (2001) 'The Social Psychological Limits of Participation?' in B. Cooke & U. Kothari (eds.), *Participation: The New Tyranny?* London & New York: Zed Books.

Crankshaw, O., (1996) "Social Differentiation, Conflict and Development in a South African Township", *Urban Forum*, 7 (1): 53-67

Craythorne, D., (1993) *Municipal Administration Handbook*, Cape Town: Juta Press.

Davids, I., Theron, F., & Maphunye, K. J., (eds.) (2005) *Participatory Development in South Africa: A Development Management Perspective*, Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Davids, I., (2005) *Voices from Below: Reflections on Ten Years of Public Participation: The Case of Local Government in the Western Cape Province*. Cape Town: Foundation for Contemporary Research.

Deacon, R. and Piper, L.. (2006) "Reinforcing or challenging party dominance in South Africa? Ward committee politics in the Msunduzi municipality." paper presented at "The Place of Participation in a Democratising South Africa: Decentralisation, Local Councillors and Civil Society in Post-Apartheid Cities" Colloquium, Johannesburg: Wits University, 20 – 21st November 2006.

DBSA, (2000) *Integrated Development Planning: A Strategic Management Approach for Councillors and Senior Officials*. Halfway house: Development Bank of Southern Africa.

De Visser, J., (2006) *Developmental Local Government: A case study of South Africa*, Antwerp, Oxford: Intersentia.

DPLG (2003) *Reviewing the Establishment of Municipal Ward Committees in South Africa 2002/2003*, compiled by Shikanda Business Solutions.

DPLG (2004) *Reviewing the Establishment of Ward Committees in South Africa 2004/2005*, compiled by the Directorate: Institutional Development Systems.

Emmett, T., (2000) "Beyond Participation? Alternative Routes to Civil Engagement and Development in South Africa" *Development Southern Africa*, Vol. 17 (No. 4): 510-518.

Erasmus, V. W. H., (2000) *Administrative support services for community participation in the IDP: A case study of the Oostenberg Municipality*. Master of Public Administration dissertation, University of Stellenbosch.

Eversole, R., (2003) "Managing the Pitfalls of Participatory Development: Some Insights from Australia" *World Development*, Vol. 31 (No. 5): 781-795.

Garane, L. M., (2008) *Effective Community Participation for Integrated Community Development at Local Levels*. Research submitted to the faculty of Management, University of the Witwatersrand in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Management (Public and Development Management).

Gaventa, J., (2004) 'Towards Participatory Governance: Assessing the Transformative Possibilities' in S. Hickey & G. Mohan (eds.), *Participation: from Tyranny to Transformation?: Exploring New Approaches to Participation in Development*. (London & New York: Zed Books).

Gervais-Lambony, P., (2006) Identity, Justice and Democracy at the Ward Level in South African Cities: Space Matters. In paper presented at "The Place of Participation in a Democratising South Africa: Decentralisation, Local Councillors and Civil Society in Post-Apartheid Cities" Johannesburg: Wits University, 20 – 21st November 2006.

Geldenhuys, A. J., (1996) "Analysing democracy for local government" in Bekker, K. (ed), *Citizen Participation in Local Government*, Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Golooba-Mutebi, F., (2004) 'Reassessing Popular Participation in Uganda' *Public Administration and Development*, Vol. 24: 279-288.

Gran, G., (1983) *Development by People: Citizen Construction for a Just World*, New York: Preager.

Harrison, P., (2008) "The origins and outcomes of South Africa's Integrated Development Plans" in Van Donk, M., Swilling, M., Pieterse, E. and Parnell, S.(eds) *Consolidating Developmental Local Government: Lessons from the South African Experience*. Cape Town: UCT Press.

Harrison, K.. (2002) 'Social Capital and Local Government' in S. Parnell, E. Pieterse, M Swilling, and D. Woodridge (eds.), *Democratising Local Government: the South African Experience*. (Landsdowne: University of Cape Town Press).

Harrison, P.. (2005) *Integrated Development Plans and Third Way Politics*. unpublished draft chapter.

Heller, P.. (2001) 'Moving the State: The Politics of Democratic Decentralisation in Kerala, South Africa, and Porto Alegre.' *Politics and Society*, 29 (1): 131-136

Hickey, S.. & Mohan, G., (eds.) 2004. 'Towards Participation as Transformation: Critical Themes and Challenges' in *Participation: from Tyranny to Transformation?: Exploring New Approaches to Participation in Development*. (London & New York: Zed Books).

Hicks, J.. (2005) "Assessing the effectiveness of community participation based involvement" in *Paper presented at Trade Conferences International conference 'Community-based planning through ward committees'*, 1-2 September 2005, Johannesburg. www.cpp.org.za (Last viewed 04 September 2008)

Houston, G et al. (2001) "Public Participation in the Integrated Development Planning of Local Government in Pretoria" in Houston, G. and Humphries, R. (eds.) *Public Participation in Democratic Governance in South Africa*. Pretoria: HSRC

Huchzermeyer, M.. (2002) "Informal settlements: Production and intervention in twentieth-century Brazil and South Africa." *Latin American Perspectives*, 29 (1): 83-105.

Jennings, R.. (2000) Participatory Development as New Paradigm: The Transition of Development Professionalism. Paper prepared for the 'Community based Reintegration and Rehabilitation in Post-Conflict Settings' Conference, Washington DC, October 2000. IDASA (2002) The Establishment of Ward Committees, December 11.

Kapoor, I.. (2002) 'The Devil's in the Theory: A Critical Analysis of Robert Chambers' work on Participatory Development' *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 23 (No. 1): 101-117.

Kothari, U.. (2001) "Power, Knowledge and Social Control in Participatory Development", in Cooke and Kothari (eds.), *Participation: The New Tyranny*. London: Zed Press.

Liebenberg, S.. & Stewart, P., (eds.) (1997) *Participatory Development Management and the RDP*. (Kenwyn: Juta & Co. Ltd).

Liebenberg, A. L., (1998) *Integrated Development planning: applying the theory in Worcester*. MA. University of Stellenbosch.

Liebenberg, A. L., (1998) *Integrated Development Planning: Applying the theory in Worcester*. Study project presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Masters degree in Public and Development Management. University of Stellenbosch.

Mackay, J., (2004) *Developmental Local Government: A Study of Public Participation of the Integrated Development Planning Process of the City of Cape Town*. University of the Western Cape: Mini-thesis in partial fulfillment of an MA degree.

Masango, R., (2002) 'Public Participation: A Critical Ingredient of Good Governance' *Politeia*, Vol. 21 (No. 2): 52-65.

Mayoux, L., (1995) 'Beyond Naivet: Women, Gender Inequality and Participatory Development' *Development and Change*, Vol. 2 (No. 6): 235-258

Municipal Demarcation Boards (MDB). (2000) *Municipal and Ward Boundary Changes*. Pretoria, MDB.

McEwan. C.. (2004) *New spaces of citizenship? Rethinking gendered participation and empowerment in South Africa*. draft paper.

Midgley, J.. (1986) *Community Participation, Social Development and the State*. (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd).

Mohan, G.. (2001) 'Beyond Participation: Strategies for Deeper Empowerment' in B. Cooke & U. Kothari (eds.), *Participation: The New Tyranny?*. (London & New York: Zed Books).

Mohamed. S. E.. (2006) "From ideas to practice: the involvement of informal settlement communities in policy-making at city level in South Africa." in *South African Review of Sociology* (previously *Society in Transition*) 2006, 37 (1)

Nyalunga. D.. (2006) "Crafting Active Citizen Participation through Ward Committees" in *International NGO Journal Vol. 1 (3) December*

Oldfield. S.. (2002) "Embedded Autonomy and the Challenge of Developmental Local Government" in Parnell, S., Pieterse, E., Swilling, M. & Wolldridge, D. (eds.), *Democratising Local Government: The South African Experience*. Cape Town: UCT Press.

Oldfield. S.. (2008) "Participatory Mechanisms and Community Politics: Building Consensus and Conflict" in Van Donk, M., Swilling, M., Pieterse, E. and Parnell, S.(eds) *Consolidating Developmental Local Government: Lessons from the South African Experience*. Cape Town: UCT Press.

Parfitt. T.. (2004) 'The Ambiguity of Participation: A Qualified Defence of Participatory Development' *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 25 (No. 3): 537-556.

Planact (1992) *The reorganisation of local government in South Africa: One City Research Project*. Johannesburg, May

Piper, L. and Chanza, N., (2006) "Too 'raw' to represent: the marginalisation of youth in Msunduzi ward committees" in *Critical Dialogue –Public Participation in Review*. Vol. 2 no. 1

Putnam, R.D., (1993) *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Putu, M., (2006) *The Role of Ward Committees in Enhancing Public Participation in Rustenburg Municipality: A Critical Evaluation*. Citizen Leadership Unit, IDASA.

Ramphela, M., (1991) 'Social Disintegration in the Black Community: Implications for Transformation' *Monitor*, Vol. 7 (No. 16)

Rauch, T., (2003) *Principles of Integrated Development Planning and assessment of the Process 2001/2002*. Department of Provincial and Local Government, Pretoria: UNDP & SALGA

Republic of South Africa (RSA), (1993) *Local Government Transition Act No. 109 of 1993*. Pretoria: Government Printers

Republic of South Africa (RSA), (1998) *Local Government Municipal Structures Act No. 117 of 1998*. Pretoria: Government Printers

Republic of South Africa (RSA), (2000) *Local Government Municipal Systems Act No. 32 of 2000*. Pretoria: Government Printers

Republic of South Africa (RSA), (1998) *Local Government White Paper No. 423 of 1998*. Pretoria: Government Printers

Republic of South Africa (RSA), (1998) *White Paper on Reconstruction and Development of 1994*. Pretoria: Government Printers

Republic of South Africa (RSA), (1996) *The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act No. 108 of 1996*. Pretoria: Government Printers

Robinson, J., (2008) "Continuities and Discontinuities in South African Local Government" in Van Donk, M., Swilling, M., Pieterse, E. and Parnell, S.(eds) *Consolidating Developmental Local Government: Lessons from the South African Experience*. Cape Town: UCT Press.

Stiefel, M and Wolfe, M., 1994. *A Voice for the Excluded –Popular Participation in Development*. London: Zed Books Ltd.

Stoker, G., 2002. "International Trends in Local Government Transformation" in Parnell, S., Pieterse, E., Swilling, M. & Wooldridge, D. (eds). *Democratising local government: the South African experiment*. Cape Town: UCT Press.

Tapscott, C., (2006) *The Challenges of Deepening Democracy in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. A paper presented to a LORC Seminar Ryukoku University, Kyoto 7 July 2006

Theron, F., 2005. 'Public Participation as a Micro-Level Development Strategy' in Davids, I., Theron, F., & Maphunye, K. J., (eds.), *Participatory Development in South Africa: A Development Management Perspective*, (Pretoria: Van Schaik).

Theron, F. and Ceaser, N., (1999) "Assessing attitudes and perceptions on integrated development planning: The case of Stellenbosch." *Administratio Publica*, vol. 9 no. 2 December

Tshishonga, N.S., (2007) *Building Local Democratic Governance through Ward Committees at eThekweni-Durban Municipality*. Research submitted to the faculty of Management, University of the Witwatersrand in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Management (Public and Development Management).

Todes, A., Williamson, A. and Sithole, P., (2006) "Decentralising voice: women's participation in Integrated Development Planning processes in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa." in Paper presented at "*The Place of Participation in a Democratising South Africa: Decentralisation, Local Councillors and Civil Society in Post-Apartheid Cities*" Johannesburg: Wits University, 20 – 21st November 2006.

Urban Sector Network (2001) *Case Study on Community Participation in Local Government in South Africa*. Charles Stewart Mott Foundation

Wallis, M., (1996) 'Community Participation in Africa: The Case of Kenya' in P. S Reddy (ed.), *Perspectives on Local Government Management and Development in Africa*. (Durban: University of Durban-Westville, Department of Public Administration).

Wight, S.A. (ed.), (1999) *The Art of Facilitating Participation: Releasing the Power of Grassroots Communication*. London: Sage.

Williams, JJ (2006). "Community Participation: Lessons from post-apartheid South Africa" in *Policy Studie Journals*, Vol 27, No. 3

Wilson, D., (1999) 'Exploring the Limits of Public Participation in Local Government' *Parliamentary Affairs*, Vol. 52 (No. 2): 246-258.

Wright, S., & Nelson, N., (eds.) 1995. 'Participation and Power' in *Power and Participatory Development: Theory and Practice*. (London: Intermediate Technology Publications).